This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UC-NRLF
$B 193 919

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA

GIFT OF
HORACE W. CARPENTIER

MEMOIRS

OF THE

LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. BRIAN WALTON, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER,

EDITOR OF THE LONDON POLYGLOT BIBLE.

WITH NOTICES OF HIS COADJUTORS IN THAT ILLUSTRIOUS WORK;
OF THE CULTIVATION OF ORIENTAL LEARNING, IN THIS COUNTRY,
PRECEDING AND DURING THEIR TIME;

AND OF THE

Authorized English Version of the Bible,

TO A PROJECTED REVISION OF WHICH DR. WALTON AND SOME OF HIS ASSISTANTS IN THE POLYGLOT WERE APPOINTED.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

DR. WALTON'S OWN VINDICATION

OF THE

LONDON POLYGLOT.

BY THE

REV. HENRY JOHN TODD, M.A. F.S.A.

CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY, AND RECTOR OF SETTRINGTON,
COUNTY OF YORK.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

London:

PRINTED FOR F. C. & J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL; AND
LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, & BROWN, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1821.

CARPENTIER

Printed by R. Gilbert, St. John's Square, London.

BX5199
W3T7
V.2

THE

CONSIDERATOR CONSIDERED:

OR,

A BRIEF VIEW OF CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA, THE PROLEGOMENA, AND APPENDIX THEREOF.

Wherein, amongst other Things, the Certainty, Integrity, and Divine Authority of the Original Texts, is defended against the Consequences of Atheists, Papists, Antiscripturists, &c. inferred from the Various Readings, and Novelty of the HEBREW POINTS, by the Author of the said

CONSIDERATIONS;

THE BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA,

And Translations therein exhibited, with the Various Readings, Prolegomena, and Appendix, vindicated from his Aspersions and Calumnies;

AND

The Questions about the Punctuation of the Hebrew Text, the Various Readings, and the ancient Hebrew Character, briefly handled.

BY

BRIAN WALTON, D.D.

"For we can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth." 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS ROYCROFT, &c.

1659.

M877556

A

SUMMARY

OF THE

SEVERAL CHAPTERS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

An Introduction to the whole 1

CHAPTER II.

The occasion and motives of these Considerations examined 19

CHAPTER III.

The Charges against the Biblia Polyglotta enumerated, and proved to be for the most part Calumnies 39

CHAPTER IV.

The first, and main Charge, That the Original Texts have gross corruptions, particularly answered, and proved a Calumny 48

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

The second, third, and fourth Charges, That our Copies are not the same with those anciently used. That the same fate hath attended the Scripture with other books, and that we may correct the Originals upon conjectures, answered and proved to be Calumnies 76

CHAPTER VI.

The fifth Charge about Various Readings out of Translations answered. The sixth, That the Keri and Ketib are critical notes of the Rabbins, shewed to be a Calumny. Of the notes out of Grotius 89

CHAPTER VII

The Various Readings in particular, collected and printed in the Biblia Polyglotta, vindicated . . . 125

CHAPTER VIII.

The consequences against the certainty and Divine authority of Scripture, inferred by the Adversary from Various Readings, &c. on the behalf of Papists, Atheists, Antiscripturists, &c. answered, and retorted upon himself 157

CHAPTER IX.

PAGE

His Arguments against the several Translations. The Samaritan, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, Latin, Ethiopic, Persian, answered 178

CHAPTER X.

The Question about the Hebrew points propounded. The Hebrews had vowels before the invention of points. The reading certain without points. The Masorites pointed not the Text at pleasure, but according to the true and common Reading. The first occasion of this Controversy about the points 206

CHAPTER XI.

The arguments against the Divine Original of the modern points vindicated. The testimony of the chief Protestant Divines, and of the most eminent for Eastern learning, and greatest patrons of the Original Texts, against their Divine extract, produced. The contrary arguments urged in the Considerations answered 242

CHAPTER XII.

The consequence of uncertainty of the Hebrew Text, if the points be not of Divine authority, urged by Papists, &c. and inferred by the Considerator, answered. The Argument retorted upon him 273

CHAPTER XIII.

PAGE

Of our knowledge of the Hebrew, derived from the Sept. Translation. That the Samaritan was the ancient Hebrew Character, changed by Esdras into the Assyrian, proved. The arguments to the contrary answered. The Conclusion 282

Observations upon the preceding Vindication . . . 309

THE

CONSIDERATOR

CONSIDERED.

CHAPTER I.

I. *The Church of England assaulted by Romanists on the one hand, and Novellists on the other: so are some of her Sons in this Edition of the Biblia Polyglotta.* II. *The like fate of others who laboured most in exact Editions of the Bible; Origen, St. Jerom.* III. *Arias Montanus, Erasmus, the Publisher of the late Parisian Bible, the late Translators into English.* IV. *The nature of Envy.* V. *This Edition of the Biblia Polyglotta generally approved; more performed in it than in any former Edition; the usefulness of it; no book free from opposition.* VI. *The Considerations published against it, what they are.* VII. *A new plot pretended to be discovered amongst Protestants, against the Original Texts, approved in the Prolegomena to the Biblia Polyglotta: The particulars of this design: The principles and consequences: The chief Protestant Divines and Linguists of this age named, whom the Adversary makes guilty of this plot: Himself saith the same things.* VIII. *The calumnies about Various Readings.* IX. *Other parts of this Charge mistaken.* X. *Reasons why this Pamphlet was answered.*

I. It was the speech of a grave historian, (Thucyd.) that οἱ ἐν μέσῳ ἀμφοτέρωθεν κτείνονται, *those that are in the midst are slain* (or assaulted) *on both*

sides. With which agrees too that of Aristotle, *Ethic.* lib. 2. c. 8. Ἀπωθεῖσθαι τὸν μέσον οἱ ἄκροι ἑκάτερος πρὸς ἑκάτερον. *Expellunt medium extremi uterque ad alterum.* This was the case of our Mother the Church of England in former times, as was long since observed by a reverend [A] author, when she was (like Christ crucified between two thieves) opposed by the superstitious Romanists on the one hand, and by the fiery Novellists on the other; the first accusing her of departing too far from them, the other of coming too near to them. Which contrary accusations of men, running into extremes, were a strong evidence that she walked in the mean; which is the best and safest; for, *Medium tenuere beati.* This, which was the condition of the mother, is now become the lot of some of her sons in *the late edition of the Biblia Polyglotta:* for whereas the publisher of the said Bible hath laboured to assert the purity, integrity, and supreme authority of the Original Texts against those of Rome on the one side, rejecting some Jewish opinions unwarily swallowed by some amongst ourselves on the other, he hath incurred the displeasure of both; the one complaining that too much is ascribed to the Original Texts; the other, too little. Which is a good argument that he hath kept close to the truth, from which those, that do *extrema sectari,* do usually swerve.

II. This is no new thing, that endeavours to promote the public good should be thus rewarded; for in former ages we find, that those who laboured most about the sacred oracles of God, to restore them to their primitive and original lustre, and to wipe off that dust which by injuries of time and ignorance or negligence of transcribers was contracted, and so to transmit them pure and incorrupt to posterity; (for such God raised up in all ages;) whose endeavours, one would think, might have set the authors without the reach of calumny and envy, have yet been aspersed and slandered, their labours calumniated, and their aims perverted, by such as St. James speaks of, iv. 5. "In whom the spirit that lusts after envy reigned." Origen's pains in compiling his Tetrapla, Hexapla, and Octapla, a work of that admirable use, that it was styled *Opus Ecclesiæ*, and which by the unexcusable negligence of the Greek church is now lost, was carped and cavilled at amongst others by Jerom, as if he had corrupted the pure translation of the LXX. by the additions which he made out of Theodotion; when as Origen, to preserve the LXX in its integrity, distinguished all the additions by an asterisk, which being left out, what remained was the mere and true translation of the Septuagint, as Jerom himself sometimes acknowledged, Epist. 11. ad Au-

gustin. The same Jerom was paid in the like coin by others, who rejected his Latin Translation, (the first in Latin that was made out of the Hebrew text,) as appears by Ruffine, St. Augustine, and other learned men of those times; who interpreted this attempt of his (though in itself very laudable) as done, *in contumeliam Versionis τῶν ὁ,* to disgrace that of the Septuagint; (as some now interpret all that is said of the use of ancient Translations, as tending to the depressing of the Hebrew;) whereupon he was often put to apologize for himself.

III. To come nearer to our own times: That [B] magnificent work of the King of Spain's Bible (by some styled *Orbis Miraculum*) was approved by the Pope himself, to whom it was presented, as by his Breves prefixed appears. Yet all could not protect the publisher thereof, Arias Montanus, (a learned and moderate Romanist, though he did nothing without the advice of the University of Louvain, and of sundry particular learned men,) from the jealousies and calumnies of malignant spirits of his own brethren, against whom he was fain to write Apologies, and hardly escaped the Inquisition. Erasmus's extraordinary pains, in publishing the Greek Testament by comparing ancient Copies and Translations, was sufficiently railed at by some friars and ignorant zealots, as if he took upon him *to correct the Word of God;* as appears

in his Preface to his Annotations of 1535, whose very words are used, as we shall see hereafter, against the *Biblia Polyglotta.* And that late [C]splendid work of the Parisian Bible, published at the charges of Michael Le Jay in seven languages, which far exceeds the Biblia Regia, by addition of that ancient Syriac Translation of the Old Testament, the Arabic of the Old and New, and the Samaritan Pentateuch, &c. though it be not without its defects, which ingenuous and moderate men would rather have excused than aggravated, yet hath not wanted its detractors; who, envying that others should have the glory of that which themselves were unable to perform, have defamed it what they could. Witness those bitter and virulent expressions of Simeon de Muis, Regius Professor of the Hebrew at Paris, in his Epistles published against it. And to come yet nearer home: The last [D] English Translation made by diverse learned men at the command of King James, though it may justly contend with any now extant in any other language in Europe, was yet carped and cavilled at by diverse among ourselves, especially by [E] one, who being passed by and not employed in the work, as one (though skilled in the Hebrew, yet) of little or no judgment in that or any other kind of learning, was so highly offended, that he would needs undertake to shew how many thousand places they had

falsely rendered, when as he could hardly make good his undertaking in any one.

IV. Thus we see, that "for every good work is a man envied of his neighbour," as the Wise Man observed, Eccles. iv. 4. Our Saviour, for the good works he had done, had like to have been stoned by the people; and the Scribes and Elders, out of envy, delivered him to be put to death. "Licet invenire regionem ubi venena non sunt, quemadmodum affirmant de Creta; at non licet invenire Rempublicam quæ non alat invidiam," as Plut. in Moral. *Some countries there be, where no venomous creature lives, as they say of Candy; but none where the poison of envy is not found.* Yea, so monstrous is this sin, that the envious man makes another's virtue his vice, and another's happiness his torment: "Invidia Siculi non invenere tyranni majus tormentum." Whereas he, that rejoiceth at the good of another, is thereby made partaker of it: For "Tolle invidiam, et tuum est quod habeo: Tolle invidiam, et meum est quod habes;" as Chrysost. in Joh.

V. It cannot seem strange then, that *this late work of the Bible*, though generally approved by learned men, both in the first undertaking, when the particulars, whereof it was to consist, with a specimen thereof, were published to the world; and since it was finished, when not only all was

performed which was undertaken, but also more than could justly be expected; should, notwithstanding, meet with some disaffected persons, who seek to defame and blast it. There have ever been some, that would make themselves seem fairer by throwing dirt in the faces of others, and account themselves the better by how much they speak the worse of others: for "Gloriæ comes invidia;" and it never was the hap of any book, yet, to meet with no opposition; ᾧ μηδὶς ἀντειπῇ as Clemens Alex. observed long since. "Deus omnibus placere non potest; et tu placere credis?" said Jul. Scal. *God himself cannot please all men; and how can any of us then hope for it?* Erasmus's complaint was just against his censurers: "Superbum est de libro sententiam ferre quem non intelligis, superbius et de eo quem ne legeris quidem." Præf. eadem. Yet we find usually, that this envious humour is attended with ignorance: "Vituperant quæ ignorant," said Tertul. *Ignorance is the greatest enemy to any kind of knowledge;* and Jos. Scaliger met with such, of whom he writes, "Quicquid eorum captum superat erratum vocant, et quod non intelligunt pro inscitia sua damnant:" how this may be applied, I leave to the judgment of others. This I find too true, that though there never was so much done in any Edition of the Bible in any age (*absit invidia verbo,*) as to exhibit the Original

Text of the Scripture at one view, attended with so many ancient Translations, approved by the Church in her purest times, and that according to the best Copies and Editions, which bear witness to the authority and integrity of the Originals, and serve as so many glasses to represent the true sense and meaning of them to succeeding ages, and to preserve the sacred truth to posterity, as far as human industry can reach, against the corruptions and false glosses, wherewith Sectaries and Heretics, (who in no age so abounded as in this,) would adulterate and embase it; yet this could not free the work from the opposition of malicious tongues and pens of such, whom the envious man hath stirred up to hinder the benefit which the Church of God might reap by it. Witness *a* [F] *late Pamphlet,* pretending to the integrity and purity of the Hebrew and Greek Text, to which are added *Certain Considerations on the Prolegomena and Appendix to the late Biblia Polyglotta.*

VI. In which, I was sorry to find so much clean paper fouled with so many palpable untruths, wilful and studied calumnies, such contradictions, tautologies, and impertinencies, as appear in those *Considerations;* that, if they should be culled out of the book, we might say of it, as Apollodorus the Athenian of Chrysippus's writings, that if one should take away τὰ ἀλλότρια, *all that was either*

none of his own, or nothing to the purpose, κίνος αὐτῷ ὁ χάρτης, they would be empty of all matter. For there is scarce any thing true or useful concerning the subjects here disputed, which was not formerly said in those *Prolegomena;* nor any thing concerning the same which is added by the adversary as his own, which is not sufficiently confuted in the same *Prolegomena.* Not to mention the incoherence of the things here handled, the whole being, " rudis indigestaque moles," *a confused heap of Independencies.*

VII. In these *Considerations* we are told of a new " plot or design amongst Protestants, after they are come out of Rome, a design which they dare not publicly own," p. 329. " The leprosy of Papists, crying down the Original Texts, is broken forth among Protestants, with what design, to what end or purpose, he knows not; God knows, and the day will manifest." Epist. p. 14. " That this design is owned in the *Prolegomena to the Bible,* and in the *Appendix;* that they print the Original and defame it, gathering up Translations of all sorts, and setting them up in competition with it." Epist. p. 9. " That they take away all certainty in and about all sacred truth." Epist. p. 25. " That there is nothing left unto men, but to choose whether they will turn Papists or Atheists." Epist. p. 9. " That there

are gross corruptions befallen the Originals, which by the help of old Translations, and by conjectures, may be found out and corrected," p. 205. "As pernicious a principle as ever was fixed upon since the foundation of the Church of Christ," Epist. p. 21. "That it is the foundation of Mahometanism, the chiefest and principal prop of Popery, the only pretence of fanatical Antiscripturists, and the root of so much hidden atheism in the world," p. 147. "That he fears the pretended infallible judge, or the depth of atheism, lies at the the door of these considerations," p. 161. "That they are enough to frighten unstable souls into the arms of an infallible guide," p. 196. "That these various Translations, as upon trial they will be found to be, are such, as many will be ready to question the foundation of all," p. 207. "And therefore he had rather all Translations should be consumed out of the earth," p. 318. "than such a figment should be admitted; that *(setting aside two Theses)* there is no opinion ventilated among Christians tending to the depression of the worth, and impairing the esteem, of the Hebrew Copies, which is not directly, or by just consequence, owned in these *Prolegomena,*" p. 205. Hence are these tragical exclamations of "dreadful distemper, which may well prove mortal to the truth of the Scripture," p. 314. "of horrible and outrageous violence offered to

the sacred verity," p. 315. "that men take upon them to correct the Scripture," p. 344. "to correct the Word of God," p. 180. These are some of the expressions used by the author of the *Considerations*, who yet writes "with all Christian candour and moderation of spirit," p. 151. "candidly for the sake and pursuit of truth, with a mind freed from all prejudice and disquieting affections," p. 155. Now, those dangerous principles, about which all this stir is made, are chiefly reduced to two; (though many be pretended;) 1. That the Hebrew points (that is, the modern forms now used, not the vowels and accents themselves, which are acknowledged to be coeve with the other letters, and that the reading of the text was never arbitrary, but the same before and after the punctuation,) were devised and fixed by the Masorites about five hundred years after Christ: 2. That there are Various Readings in the Old and New Testament, both in the Hebrew and Greek, (by the casual mistake of transcribers, yet in matters of no moment,) which, by comparing ancient Copies, may be found out, and in some cases out of ancient Translations; and when they are discovered, the true reading may be restored. Hence is inferred, "the uncertainty of all Divine truth, that the Scriptures are corrupt, &c." And hence are those fears and jealousies, Epist. p. 19. which how justly deducible from these, or any

other principles in the *Prolegomena* or *Appendix*, shall hereafter appear. In the mean time, our author practises what Quintilian said of some Roman orators, who did *causarum vacua convitiis implere*; and, instead of arguments, loads his adversary with reproaches, like that soldier in Darius's army, (mentioned by Plutarch,) who, instead of fighting with his hands, employed his tongue in railing upon Alexander; whereupon the general struck him with his lance, and told him, he hired him to fight, and not to rail. Who those Protestants are that concur with the *Prolegomena* in those Principles, the adversary is ashamed to mention; though he knew they were at large cited in the *Prolegomena*; because their very names would have spoiled his whole project, and made his charge appear a mere calumny. They are no other (concerning the novelty of the Hebrew punctuation) than Luther, Zuinglius, Brentius, Pellican, Œcolampadius, Calvin, Beza, Musculus, Paulus Fagius, Mercer, Cameron, Chamier, Piscator, Scaliger, Casaubon, De Dieu, Grotius, Cappellus, Erpenius, Sixtinus Amama, Salmasius, Schickard, Martinius; also Rivet, Spanhemius, Fest. Hommius, as appears by their Epistles to Cappellus in his Defensio Criticæ, &c.; and amongst ourselves Archbishop Usher, Bishop [G] Prideaux, Mr. Selden, Mr. Mede, Mr. Eyres, and many others; not to name those now living,

the most eminent Divines that have appeared in the Protestant cause, and most zealous defenders of the purity and authority of the Original Texts, or the chiefest Linguists that this age hath produced, and best skilled in the Hebrew and other Oriental learning. And for that other point of Various Lections, not only the same men, but all others generally which will believe their eyes, (two or three excepted,) grant the same which the author of the *Prolegomena* doth, and that without any prejudice to the certainty or divine authority of Scripture, as is shewed at large in the *Prolegomena;* and shall hereafter be made manifest. Yea, our adversary himself frequently confesses the same; and saith, that "ocular inspection makes it manifest, that there are Various Readings both in the Old Testament and the New; and it is confessed there have been failings in the transcribers, who have often mistaken; and that it is impossible it should be otherwise, &c." pp. 165, 191, 178, 296; whereby he makes himself evidently guilty of the crimes which he unjustly charges upon others, and of those consequences which he infers on the behalf of Papists, Atheists, Antiscripturists, &c. and so overthrows that which he would seem to contend for, viz. the certainty and supreme authority of Scripture; and therefore I may say unto him, "ex ore tuo," *out of thy own mouth shalt thou be judged,* and use the

words of the Apostle, Rom. ii. 1. "Wherefore thou art unexcusable, O man, that condemnest another, for hereby thou condemnest thine own self; for thou doest the same things."

VIII. When I first read this Pamphlet I stood amazed at the strange boldness of the author, charging the *Prolegomena* with such tenets and assertions, which they are so far from maintaining, that they do assert and prove the plain contrary, and that not *obiter*, or by the by, but *ex professo*, in full tracts. As for instance the main charge, p. 206. "that there are corruptions, yea gross corruptions befallen the Original Texts, which men by their critical conjectures may discover and correct," is so far from truth, that the whole *Prolegom.* 7. is spent in proving that the *Original Texts* are *not corrupted either by Jews, Christians, or others; that they are of supreme authority in all matters, and the rule to try all Translations by; that the copies we now have are the true transcripts of the first αὐτόγραφα written by the sacred Penmen; that the special Providence of God hath watched over these books, to preserve them pure and uncorrupt against all attempts of Sectaries, Heretics, and others, and will still preserve them to the end of the world for that end for which they were at first written; that the errors or mistakes, which may befal by negligence or inadvertency of*

transcribers or printers, are in matters of no concernment, (from whence Various Readings have arisen,) and may by collation of other copies and other means there mentioned be rectified and amended. The arguments also brought by some Romanists against the purity, certainty, and authority, of the Original Texts, are clearly answered; wherein I doubt not but the reader may find more satisfaction, than in all these confused *Considerations*. And for gathering Various Readings by mere conjectures, the author of the *Prolegomena* is so far from approving that way, that he expressly rejects it, and gives reasons against it. *Prol.* 6. *sect. ult.* which the author of the *Considerations*, p. 209, 305, 307, doth also acknowledge with thankfulness.

IX. The like may be seen in most of his other charges, wherein he fights with his own shadow, and like a wanton whelp runs round after his own stern, dissembling his adversary's opinion, and instead thereof substituting any lame consectary which came suddenly into his distempered fancy. For whatsoever might seem odious to vulgar apprehensions, he ascribes to the *Prolegomena*; that so he might have colour to say what he lists. Other things are by him wilfully perverted and misconstrued, the controversy never truly stated, not one argument faithfully recited, much less answered, nor the tenth part of what is said in

the *Prolegomena* on the matters in question taken notice of, much less confuted; so that I was a long time in doubt whether to take notice of these *Considerations* at all by way of answer, there being nothing in them which is not in the *Prolegomena* and *Appendix* already fully answered, as those that shall please to compare both together may easily see. And this was the opinion of some men of great learning and judgment, that I should not trouble myself with any answer. Besides I have to deal with one so possessed with prejudice and passion, and thereby so pertinacious in his opinions, that I shall but *Æthiopem lavare:* he may be convinced, but not converted, and will hold his conclusion in despite of the premisses. Neither is his authority of such weight with judicious and learned men, as that they will esteem the *Biblia Polyglotta* either the better for his praises, or the worse for his censure. So that as his praises should not tickle, so neither his dispraises trouble. "Declamationes ambitiosorum" are only "otiosorum cibi," as Scal. Exerc. 307. Nor is it my lot alone to be thus handled by him. He lays about him on all sides; and like Ismael, his hand is against every one; so that we may say with the epigrammatist, "Omnibus invideas, livide; nemo tibi." Yea, the volume itself begins already to serve for waste paper in grocers' shops, and to vanish *in thuris piperisve cucullos.*

X. Yet considering that it may have come into the hands of diverse, who never saw, and it may be, cannot read or understand, the *Biblia Polyglotta*, or the *Prolegomena*, and may simply give credit to what he avers; (for though he say the opinions may be candidly disputed among learned men without danger, yet he hath thought fit to submit and expose them to the judgment of the unlearned, who cannot judge, but may wrest, what they understand not, to their own hurt; wherein either his prudence or piety may justly be called in question, in bringing a Latin tract upon an English stage;) and withal lest he might complain that he was neglected, or brag amongst his ignorant proselytes that he could not be answered; and further seeing that there is as S. Ambr. de Offic. i. c. 3. saith, *otiosum silentium*, as well as *otiosum verbum*, and I would be loth to be guilty of the one, as my adversary is of the other; and withal because he threatens in many places, p. 152, 153, 193, 201, 305, 320, 345, "a further search, and to make more discoveries of great matters: I thought it not altogether unfit, (though I want not other employments wherein to spend my hours,) *both in right to myself, and this Work of the Bible, and to all those reverend and worthy persons, whose approbations have commended it to the public, as also of all those great and learned Divines and others, some of*

which I have now mentioned, who are involved in the same cause, to take a brief view of these Considerations; and to examine the grounds of those consequences which he would infer, and to shew how unjustly and uncharitably he hath dealt; that so the *Prolegomena, Appendix, and several Translations, may be vindicated from his false aspersions; the true use of the Work maintained for the public good of the Church; the truth asserted against his sophisms and declamations; the reader disabused; their judgments rectified, who may be misled by a popular Pamphlet fitted for vulgar capacities not for scholastical judgments; and all further error and misconstruction prevented in what shall be hereafter offered by him or others upon this account, so that he or whoever shall proceed in this virulent way of censuring may be without excuse.* For as Ivo, Ep. 219. "Quia falsitas præcessit, oportet ut veritas subsequatur, quæ latrocinia noctis detegat." Not that I intend to follow him in all his confused mazes, extravagancies, and tautologies; but only to insist upon the chief and most material points, which being rightly stated, and the truth proved or vindicated, I shall submit all to the judicious and indifferent reader.

CHAPTER II.

I. *The Occasion and Motives of publishing the Considerations.* II. *The Adversary begins with an untruth.* III. *His sinister Ends, writing in English against a Latin Treatise, and yet in the same book writing in Latin against the Quakers.* IV. *His love of the truth, candid and sincere dealing.* V. *His dangerous Assertions against the Miracles wrought for Confirmation of the Doctrine of the Bible, attested by the Catholic Tradition of the Church of Christ. His affirming that the Alcoran may vie Miracles and Traditions with the Scripture, rejecting all Arguments for the Authority of Scripture, save its own Light.* VI. VII. *No private or new Opinions in the Prolegomena or Appendix.* VIII. *The just grounds which the Publisher had to speak of the Things excepted against.* IX. *The groundless fears and jealousies of the Adversary.* X. *His Profession of no great Skill in this Learning.* XI. *That he knows not the Authors of this Edition.* XII. *His commending the Work, and the Authors of it.* XIII. *His Consequences charged upon the Work, and not upon the Workmen, as he pretends,* XIV. *The true Cause of the Quarrel is against the Workmen.* XV. *The Approbation of the Work by foreign Divines; Buxtorf's Testimony of it.*

I. BEFORE we descend to particulars, it will be needful to take notice, first, of the occasion and motives of publishing these *Considerations*, and of their scope and end; concerning which the author tells us, cap. i. sect. 1, 2, 3, &c. "that he

had written a Treatise of the Divine Original of the Scriptures, their authority, and self-evidencing light; and of the Providence of God in their preservation; which being ready for the press, the *Prolegomena and Appendix of the Bible* came to his hands, wherein the great bulk of Various Readings, and some opinions maintained in the *Prolegomena*, did in his apprehension much weaken the arguments by him insisted upon in that Treatise; and therefore a necessity was incumbent upon him, either to desist from publishing it, or else of giving an account of those things in the *Prolegomena and Appendix*, which tended to the disadvantage of that great truth which he had pleaded for." After, he tells us of "his fears and jealousies of dangerous consequences, &c." and gives some reasons to free himself from "any suspicion of malice or envy against the *Biblia Polyglotta*, or any that had a hand in publishing of it; and calls the searcher of all hearts to witness, how clear he was from any sinister ends, &c." and professes how "candidly he will proceed for the sake and in the pursuit of truth, with a mind free from prejudice and disquieting affections, &c."

II. Concerning all which, I shall observe, first, that it is ominous to *stumble at the threshold*, as our author here doth. What fair dealing may we expect in his ensuing Discourse, when he begins

with a palpable untruth? He saith, the *Prolegomena and Appendix* came to his hands after he had finished his Treatise of the Scripture, and was ready to give it to the Stationer; which was the occasion of these additional *Considerations;* when as yet it appears that he had read the *Prolegomena and Appendix*, before he had written the first Chapter of his Treatise; for in that Chapter he writes, p. 16. that "Cappellus's pernicious opinion about the uncertainty of Scripture is since approved, and taken up by others," quoting in the margin *Prolegomena ad Biblia Polyglotta;* and p. 20. he saith, that "ἰωηλύσιως is reckoned amongst the Various Readings, gathered out of Grotius, in the *Appendix of the Biblia Polyglotta;*" by which it is evident that he had seen and read the *Prolegomena and Appendix* before he wrote that Treatise, and therefore that the publishing of the *Prolegomena and Appendix* after his Treatise was finished, could not be the cause of writing these *Considerations* in vindication of that Treatise. Here it seems his memory failed him, to say no worse; and hereby it plainly appears, that some other motives set him on work, and not the vindication of his Treatise; and though he protests the contrary, yet *protestatio contraria facto* is not to be admitted nor regarded; for it is known that such protestations with men, who make no scruple of affirming untruths, arise

often from the consciousness of the guilt of that against which they protest. *Quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* What are his *Considerations* but a clear confutation of his protestation?

III. If he had no sinister ends, why are they written in English; the opinions which he opposes, being written in that language wherein learned men debate such things as are not fit for popular judgments? There could be no other end in this, than to expose the *Biblia Polyglotta* and Publishers of it to popular hatred. If his fears and jealousies were so great, that these opinions should gain credit, and be received, why did he not write against them in the same language which is generally known in Europe, whereby an antidote might have been ready wheresoever they came? Whereas to write in English, cannot hinder the spreading of them abroad; nor was there any great cause to fear that his English readers could be infected by them, when they understood them not, till he informed them. This was not the true motive, or else he took not the right course to prevent the mischief he seemed to fear. But to confute a Latin Treatise in English, and in the same book to add a Latin discourse against the Quakers, who abhor all learning, and account that language the *language of the beast*, will, notwithstanding his weak apology, be judged a solecism.

IV. Besides, if the truth, and love of the truth, set him on work, why doth he fasten upon his adversary things manifestly untrue, charging him with opinions in one place, which in another he clears him from? his perverting his adversary's tenets, propounding his arguments and answers by halves, cutting them short, as Procrustes (in Plut.) did his prisoners, that they might be fit for his bed, are proofs of his *candid and sincere dealing*, but chiefly his urging the consequences of Papists, Atheists, Antiscripturists, &c. whose advocate he makes himself, rather than his adversary shall escape. If he had not been led by some sinister respects, knowing that pious and learned men, yea, the learnedest Protestant Divines, and the best skilled in the Eastern languages, that are this day, and greatest assertors of the purity and authority of the Original Texts against the Romish tenets, have maintained the same, with the author of the *Prolegomena* about the Hebrew punctuation, and the Various Readings, and that himself acknowledges the main thing from which perverse and wicked men draw their conclusions, (viz. *the variety of readings in the Hebrew and Greek Copies,*) he would have laboured to free those worthies from such imputations, and have shewed, that no such consectaries could be logically and rationally deduced from such premises; as indeed they cannot: Whereas we see in him the clean

contrary; for he takes part with Papists, Atheists, Antiscripturists, &c. and pleads their cause, and labours to prove, even from such premises as himself cannot deny, that those wretched consequences do necessarily follow: Which shews plainly, how he was blinded with prejudice and passion, and how far he was from that candour and freedom from disquieting affections, and from the love of truth which he pretends to.

V. And though it had been the hard hap of the *Prolegomena and Appendix* to come out when his Treatise was ready to be printed, which hath procured all this trouble to himself and the readers; yet, was there such a necessity of the publishing his Treatise? Divers persons of great learning and judgment think his pains might very well have been spared; and that, instead of proving the Divine Authority of the Scripture, he hath much weakened it; and, what in him lies, shaken the very foundation of Religion; while he rejects that main argument to prove the Scriptures to be from God, p. 103, 104, viz. the miracles wrought by Moses and Christ, the Prophets and Apostles, to confirm their doctrine, brought down to us by the undoubted testimony and universal tradition of the Church of Christ, the most infallible and greatest of all human testimonies, and next to that which is immediately Divine; and sticks not to affirm, that the "Alcoran may vie miracles and

traditions with the Scripture," p. 105. "and that there is no more reason to believe those who have received that tradition, and plead they have it, before and against them who profess they have no such report delivered them from their forefathers," p. 108. "nor have we more inducement to give credit to their assertions, than to a like number of men holding out a tradition utterly to the contrary;" that is, why we should believe the testimony of the whole Christian Church in this point, before the testimony of Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans, to the contrary, p. 110. And whilst he grounds all upon the inward light of the Scripture itself, which though it serve to confirm the faith of believers, yet in the question, how we come to know the Scriptures to be from God, we know, is by great and learned Protestant Divines not allowed as a convincing argument in this case; I submit it to the judgment of all men of common reason and judgment, whether here be not a fair pretence for Atheists and fanatical Antiscripturists to reject the Scripture, when they find the argument from the miracles and universal tradition rejected by some, and that of the inward light of the Scripture, (which is here said to be "all the Divine evidence that God is willing to grant us, or can be granted us, or is any way needful for us, p. 34. and that there is no need of any further witness or testimony," p. 56.) not admitted as suf-

ficient by others; and whether they may not with more colour deduce their conclusions against the Scriptures from these assertions of his, than from any thing in the *Prolegomena or Appendix?* For, where they find him affirming, "that there is no way to know the Scriptures to be from God, but its own light," and find this denied by learned Divines of all sides, they have some colour to conclude, that there is no way at all to prove their Divine Original, and so to reject them.

VI. Again, he writes, p. 159, and 160, that "in all these things (it is known to all men) there is no new opinion coined or maintained by the Prefacer to these Bibles, but that all have been maintained by sundry learned men," and that, "if they had been kept in men's private writings, he should not have thought himself, or his discourse, concerned in them;" but because "they are laid as the foundation of the usefulness of the *Biblia Polyglotta*, and because of the authority which they may gain thereby," and because (as p. 152) "these private opinions," (as he calls them) "are imposed with too much advantage on the minds of men by their constant neighbourhood unto canonical truth, therefore he must needs appear against them." Here he speaks plainly what was the true cause of these *Considerations*. The *Biblia Polyglotta* are the butt against which his arrows are aimed; and these opinions about the

Hebrew punctuation and Various Readings had not been considered, nor meddled with, but for that work to which they were adjoined; which because it was always maligned by himself and some others of his party, therefore he took occasion to quarrel with these matters, that so he might bring the more obloquy upon the whole, and make it the more suspected among the vulgar.

VII. But whereas he makes them private opinions, which now, being joined with a public work, may pretend to public authority, he is much deceived; or else seeks to deceive his credulous reader: for how can they be private or new opinions which have been publicly asserted in print, before either of us were born; and have been, and are, still maintained by the chiefest and learnedest Divines in Europe, and the best skilled in Oriental Learning that have been, or are at this day, in the Christian world? Such as we have already mentioned, chap. i. sect. 7. Can these opinions be counted private, which have been, and are, publicly asserted by men of such eminent worth? Or can their being mentioned before the *Biblia Polyglotta* procure them more credit and esteem, than the venerable names of such great and learned men, with whom the Publisher of this Bible, and those that assisted him, do not think themselves fit to be named? And if they

might by these and others be defended in print, and disputed among learned men, why might they not be mentioned here? and why might not the Publisher deliver his opinion in these things, as well as others, especially writing with that moderation he uses, not magisterially imposing a belief upon any, but leaving every one to his own liberty, only shewing his reasons, why he judges one opinion more probable than another?

VIII. He conceives he had a fit occasion to speak of these things in the *Prolegomena* to this Work. For, seeing the Hebrew Text is the foundation of the whole fabric for the Old Testament, what was more proper than to speak of the Hebrew Tongue; the antiquity, use, excellency, and preservation of it; how the Text came to be pointed; what the Keri and Ketib are, which appear in most Hebrew Bibles; and because there are Various Readings both of the Old and New Testament, noted in most Editions, therefore to speak of Various Readings, whence they came, out of what Copies, and how to be gathered; and to add to what others have done, out of some ancient and choice MSS. or printed Copies; and to shew that the certainty and authority of Scripture, with the integrity of the Original Texts, is [H] not impeached or prejudiced thereby, which he asserts upon such foundations as will hold, and not upon sandy grounds, as his

adversary doth, which will not stand, not *argumentis non cogentibus*, by which the truth is more prejudiced than by confessing the invalidity of them. For when men see the weakness of them, they think we have no better to rely upon, and so begin to question and doubt the truth of all.

IX. As for his fears and jealousies, I say, that when they are groundless, they are not to be regarded; and that they are so, shall hereafter appear. We have had sad experience of the fruits of causeless fears and jealousies, which the more unjust they are, the more violent usually they are, and less capable of satisfaction. It hath been, and is, usual with some, who that they may create fears in the credulous ignorant multitude, and raise clamours against others, pretend great fears of that which they themselves no more fear than the falling of the skies; and to cry out, *Templum Domini*, when they scarce believe *Dominum Templi;* nor did the care of the Temple ever enter into their hearts; only by this artifice they drive on their own designs, and expose their adversaries to popular hatred. Those, that read the *Prolegomena* (as he saith he hath done) without prejudice, may find satisfaction enough to prevent all fears and jealousies. As for those, that with the spider suck poison out of the sweetest flowers from which the bee gets honey, I shall

not trouble myself to give them any more satisfaction; they shall bear their own guilt. I know the difference between *Scandalum datum, et acceptum;* and shall say of such, as Christ did of the Pharisees that were offended at his doctrine, "Let them alone, they are blind leaders of the blind." Truth must not be concealed, though weak men be offended at it, or wicked men wrest it to their own hurt.

X. But he saith further, p. 150, "What is there that could possibly infect him with this leaven, viz. of envy or malice?" for, first, he "neither professes any deep skill in the learning used in this work, nor is ever like to be engaged in any thing that should be set up in competition with it:" nor, secondly, "doth he know the authors and contrivers of the work; nor did he ever know that there was such a person as the chief author of this Edition but by it:" nor, thirdly, "shall he fail, upon all occasions, to commend the usefulness of the work, with the learning, pains, and diligence, of those worthy persons that brought it forth." To all which I answer, first, for his skill in this kind of learning, I shall say nothing; but leave others to judge, to whom he is better known than to myself. He is one whom I never saw, nor, till of late years, ever heard of; and, till now, he was *mihi nec beneficio nec maleficio notus.* But the less his skill is in this kind of

learning, I think the less will his censure be regarded among wise men, and I shall have the less cause to fear it. The Apostle taxes some who would be "teachers of the law, not knowing what they said, or whereof they affirmed:" I will not apply this to our author; but himself tells us, p. 224, "that it is the way of sciolists, when they have obtained a little skill in any language or science, to persuade the world, that all worth lies therein." Whether this may agree to himself or no, I will not determine, but leave every man to judge as he sees cause; but sure I am, and experience makes it good, that those who have attained a little smattering knowledge in any science, especially in the Hebrew, are usually more puffed up with that little umbratile knowledge, though weak men otherwise, and of little judgment in any real or rational learning, than those who have attained a far greater measure; and that they are more apt to censure and condemn others. I have known some citizens, yea women in London, who, having learned to read Hebrew, were so conceited of themselves, that they have despised the ablest divines about the city, and have almost doubted of the salvation of all persons that could not read Hebrew; and I remember that Schickard, a very learned Hebrician, tells us, that it is the guise of many, as soon as they understand three words of Hebrew, presently they are so con-

ceited of their own abilities, that they betake themselves to the writing of grammars; and condemns himself for his folly in that kind when he was but a novice, attempting that of which he was afterward ashamed. He was then also as earnest a patron of the antiquity of Hebrew points, as our author can be; yet afterwards, when he came to riper judgment, "he could not believe that any learned man could in good earnest maintain that opinion, but that some did it merely to shew their wit." This is therefore no argument of our adversary's freedom from sinister ends and motives, that his skill is not great in the languages, but rather proves the contrary; especially when he knows that men of the greatest eminency in this learning that the world ever had, or hath at present, have said the same with the author of the *Prolegomena;* and that *the chiefest of our own nation in that learning have had some hand in, or have at least approved, this Edition,* and those things which he so much mislikes. It might have been fit for him, and no way unbecoming his greatness, to have forborne awhile, and waited to see what those who are known to be of great judgment in these matters, of which this nation hath more than ever heretofore, would have said, and what their judgment had been, than for him, (who I think will not think himself fit to be paralleled with many,) presently to engage with such

violence and to condemn opinions, which, as appears by his discourse, he either did not thoroughly weigh, or doth not fully understand. But he, that looks through a green glass, judges every thing green which he sees, when only that is green through which he looks.

XI. As for his "not knowing the authors and contrivers of the work," though they were not known to him, yet they were known to be *Sons of the Church of England,* and such as have not apostatized from their former profession, either by heresy or schism.

XII. For his commending the work, and the authors of it, which he promises upon all occasions; his whole discourse shews what his commendations are, when he charges the work with "setting up Atheism, Popery, fanatical Antiscripturism, Mahometanism," p. 147. "with bringing in utter uncertainty in and about all sacred truth," Epist. p. 25. so that nothing remains, but that we must *either turn Papists or Atheists!* When he inveighs against all the ancient Translations, "as set up in competition with the Text," Epist. p. 9. "to correct the Word of God," p. 180. "to correct the Scripture," p. 344. that they "will be found upon trial to be such as many will be ready to question the foundation of all;" p. 206. when he tells us "of such dreadful distempers as will prove mortal to the sacred truth of the Scriptures,"

p. 314. "of horrible and outrageous violence offered to the sacred Hebrew verity," p. 315. and "rather" wishes that "this and all other works of this nature were out of the world, than one of these should be admitted;" p. 221. is this to commend the worth and usefulness of it, and the pains of the contrivers? What more bitter reviling speeches could be uttered against the most profane atheistical pamphlets which this age hath produced? Against [I] Hobbes's Leviathan, and the like? What is this but to cast dirt in one's face, and yet to persuade him that he did it not to disgrace him? Bern. in Cant. 2. speaks of the slanderer, that, when he intends the most disgrace against any, begins first to commend him; which kind of slander is, saith he, "tanto plausibilior quanto creditur ab iis qui audiunt, corde invito, et condolentis affectu proferri," *when it serves but as a foil to what follows, and as a shoeing-horn to draw on some disgraceful aspersion the better, and make the crime be thought the greater.* Saint Cyprian, Epist. 2. compares such to wrestlers, "qui antagonistas luctantes altius tollunt, quò vehementius illidant," *who lift their antagonist the higher, that they may give him the greater fall.* And therefore S. Jerom ad Pammach. et Ocean. saith, that such commendation is "honorifica contumelia," *an honourable reproach.* It is "callidum nocendi artificium," as another calls

it, *a crafty kind of artifice to do mischief.* In the mean time it is some comfort when "ne inimici quidem vituperare possunt, nisi simul laudent," as Plin. lib. iii. Ep. 12. *when our very enemies must make our praises a preface to their slanders.* If these be his commendations, let him keep them to himself.

XIII. But he saith, p. 161, that "these consequences are not charged upon the workmen, but upon the work." But I say, if upon the work then upon the workmen. The work and the workmen are so nearly related, that what is said against the one must of necessity reflect upon the other. If one should publish in print, that himself in his Treatise, by rejecting what is by all "Christians acknowledged for a main ground of their believing the Scriptures to be from God, viz. miracles, and the uninterrupted tradition of the Church, by equalling the tradition of the Mahometans for their Alcoran with the tradition of the Church for the Scriptures, and laying all upon the light and power of the word itself, doth thereby make way for atheists, and fanatic persons, &c." and should think to salve all with this distinction, that he charges not the author, but the book, with these inferences; would not he think himself concerned in the charge, and the distinction to be a mere mockery?

XIV. The truth therefore is, whatsoever is by

him pretended, and so it is generally known and believed by all that know either him or those that had a hand in publishing this work, that his quarrel is chiefly with the *persons*, and with the *work for their sakes;* and that he therefore seeks to depress the worth of the book, because such men have had the honour to bring it forth. Whereas had himself and those of his judgment been the publishers, it would have been free from all these imputations, and cried up as the greatest monument of religion and learning, which any age hath produced. Nor is it unlike, but that there was some mixture of ambition with envy, which pricked him forward. He thought to raise his own credit upon the ruin of this work, and thereby to gain some reputation amongst his disciples; that so, from the lustre of this work, he might be better known and admired. Nothing is more evident than that he hath studiously laboured to scrape together whatsoever might, with any colour, be objected against it; and, when he wanted real grounds for his calumnies, to feign whatsoever he thought might render either it, or the publisher, obnoxious to popular hatred; so that whatever motives he had, it could not be the *love of the truth* that stirred him up.

XV. Whatsoever his ends or aims were, the work hath had approbation from all ranks of men both at home and abroad, who are best able to

judge of it; so that it need not fear his censures, but will remain impregnable against the assaults and batteries of all malignant spirits. If this tree had not borne good fruit, there had been no stones thrown at it. For as Plut. "ubi nullum lumen, ibi nulla umbra; ubi nulla felicitas, ibi nulla invidia," I could produce the judgment of the best learned in Europe, expressed by several letters out of France, Germany, the Low Countries, Flanders, Italy, and other places, concerning this work; that one styles it *opus plusquam regium*, another *opus divinum*, another *opus heroicum*, &c. But I will content myself at this time with the testimony of D. Buxtorf, now Hebrew Professor at Basil, a man inferior to none for his great skill in Hebrew learning, and one with whom for divers years I have had intercourse by letters, and fair correspondence, notwithstanding our difference in judgment about the Hebrew punctuation, &c. one whose testimony our adversary cannot suspect. Thus he writes in one of his Letters: "Ad opus vestrum Biblicum quod attinet, quotquot vident mirantur; nihil in hoc genere simile Ars Typographica hactenus excudit.—Nitida sunt omnia, et, quantum deprehendere possum, correcta. Ita raptus sum sanctissimi pariter et elegantissimi operis aspectu, ut si quid ad illud exornandum consilii et auxilii conferre possum, id non solum promptè sim facturus, sed honori quoque mihi

ducturus." In another, of March 28, 1658, st. n. "Quanta cum voluptate ego sanctissimos et incredibiles vestros labores inspexerim, quanto cum gaudio eos exceperim, illi testabuntur, quibus ego opus vestrum ostendi et commendavi, &c." This, and more to his purpose, writes this great Hebrician, whose judgment is enough in the opinion of all knowing men to preponderate all the light and frivolous cavils of many *Considerators*.

CHAPTER III.

I. *The particulars of the Charge many; the principal are about Various Readings, and the Hebrew Points.* II. *The general Charge of depressing the esteem of the Hebrew Copies proved false.* III. *Ten particular Charges in the Considerations, proved to be false; the words of the Prolegomena set opposite to them. The Prolegomena affirm the direct contrary to what is charged. The Adversary's candour and love of the truth, &c.*

I. We come now to the particular charges and criminations of the *Considerator*. We find them several times mustered up: first, in the Epistle, p. 9. then, in the Considerations, p. 157, 158. and again, p. 205, 206. In all which places, though many particulars are enumerated to make the greater shew, yet in his discourse he chiefly insists upon two things, viz. the [K] *Various Readings of the Original Texts*, and the [L] *Novelty of the Hebrew Punctuation*; and in the same Epist. p. 25, he reduces all to those two heads; from which he deduces the *uncertainty of the Scriptures*, the corruption of the Originals, and those other consequences which he would fasten upon the *Biblia Polyglotta*. For our more orderly proceeding, we shall first lay down the several particulars charged upon the *Prolegomena*, as they are exhibited in the *Considerations*; and then what it is

which is asserted or maintained in the *Prolegomena;* and, after, we shall proceed to the examination of the particulars.

II. But before we enter upon the several heads, we must consider one *general charge* mentioned, p. 205. and which includes most of the rest, viz. "that excepting that figment of the Jews corrupting the Bible, out of hatred to the Christians, and the thesis preferring this or that Translation in general above the Original, there is no opinion, that he knows of, that was ever ventilated among Christians, tending to the depression of the worth, or impairing the esteem, of the Hebrew Copies, which is not directly, or by just consequence, owned in these *Prolegomena.*" This will appear to be most untrue in the severals, by him mentioned, when we shall come to them; where we shall make it appear, that the Hebrew Copies are not at all impeached by any thing maintained in the *Prolegomena,* unless he mean that some cabalistical mysteries, (or rather fopperies,) from whence strange observations are drawn, to the depraving and perverting of the Scripture, and exposing the Hebrew Text to scorn and contempt, are not owned. Such rabbinical fancies taken up by some Christians, it is true, are rejected and condemned; for the publisher doth not believe, that the esteem and worth of the Hebrew Text is advanced by any untruth, or by the vain

and groundless conceits of such idle pretenders, but rather impaired and lessened. But as for the *due honour and integrity of the Original Texts*, and preserving the *true esteem* of them to posterity he doubts not, but that it will be acknowledged by all unprejudiced persons, that he hath done more than hath been hitherto done by any.

III. After this *general calumny*, our Author instances in divers particulars to make good his general charge, which are reckoned up in divers places: In the Epist. p. 9. and 25. afterwards in the *Considerations*, p. 151. 158, &c. and again, p. 205, 206. and in divers other places. These we shall collect, as they are scattered and dispersed in these *Considerations*. And that the truth or falsehood of them may the better appear, we shall withal set down the several tenets, as they are asserted in the *Prolegomena*, parallel with them.

Considerations.	*Prolegomena.*
1. That the Original Copies of the Scripture are corrupt, yea, have gross corruptions in them, so that they are no ground for faith to rest upon, p. 147, 158, 159, 206, 314, 345, and Epist. p. 9, 10, 21.	1. That the Original Texts are not corrupted either by Jews or others, either before Christ, or since, but are pure, entire, authentic, and of supreme authority in all matters of faith, and the rule whereby to try all Translations, *Proleg.* vii. sect. 1. proved at large.

Considerations.

2. That there were other Copies of the Original Hebrew and Greek, differing from those we now enjoy, which are quite lost, p. 206, 311, 312. Epist. p. 10.

3. That the same fate hath attended the Scripture in its transcription, as hath done other books, God's providence watching no more over this than other books, p. 173, 206.

Prolegomena.

2. That the Copies we now have, are the true transcripts of the ἀντίγραφα of the Prophets and Apostles, and the very same, proved, *Prolegom.* vii. sect. 16.

3. That the Scripture hath been subject to casual mistakes of transcribers and printers in small matters, of no moment, which by comparing of other Copies, and by other means, may be rectified and amended; and that in this it hath had the same fate with other books often transcribed; yet the special care and providence of God hath so watched over it, that in all things which concern faith and good life, and in all matters of weight and moment, no error hath befallen it; and that his special providence will preserve it entire against all endeavour of heretics or others to the end of the world, *Prolegom.* vi. sect. 1, 8.

Considerations.

4. That it is lawful to collect Various Readings, and to correct the Text, upon mere conjectures, p. 151, 206.

5. That the Keri and Ketib are Various Readings, and gathered by some Judaical rabbins out of ancient Copies, partly their critical amendments, or conjectures, p. 157, 206.

6. That the end of printing ancient Translations in this Bible, is by them, to correct the Original Text, though there be no diversity in the Copies, p. 158, 206, 311, 314. Epist. p. 21, 25. to set them in competion with the Text, p. 174, 311, 315. Epist. p. 9. to correct the Word of God. p. 180. to correct the Scripture, p. 344.

Prolegomena.

Prolegom. vii. sect. 12, 15. *Præf.* p. 1.

4. That to collect Various Readings by mere conjectures, (when there is no difference in the Copies or Translations,) is not safe: It would open a window for busy wits to deprave the Scripture, and to turn it into any sense, &c. *Proleg.* vi. sect. 12.

5. That the Keri and Ketib, are not critical amendments, or conjectures of the rabbins, but Various Readings, gathered out of ancient Copies, *Proleg.* viii. sect. 25.

6. The end of these ancient Translations is, first, they served as pipes to convey those living waters from the fountains to particular nations; secondly, to confirm our faith by their consent and harmony among themselves, and with the Original Texts in all matters of moment; thirdly, to bear witness to the purity and integrity of

Considerations.

7. That the Hebrew points or vowels and accents, are a novel invention of some Judaical rabbins, about five or six hundred years after the giving out of the Gospel, p. 157. Epist. p. 9.

Prolegomena.

the Original Texts, by their consent and agreement therewith and to prevent all future corruption by sectaries, heretics, or negligence of scribes; fourthly, to explain the true sense and meaning of the Text, as it was understood in the first and purest times, &c. *Proleg.* v. sect. 1, 2, 3.

7. That the Hebrew tongue consists of vowels and consonants, and always had vowels, as all other languages have, viz. א ו י to which some add ה and ע all which anciently by Josephus, St. Jerom, Origen, &c. were called vowels, as in other Eastern Tongues; the Syr. Chald. Arab. &c. By their twenty-two letters, of which these are part, the Hebrews might and did express all their words, as well as all other nations, who had their letters and alphabets, with the names and order of them, from the Hebrew long before the invention

Considerations.

8. That the vowels and accents are the arbitrary invention of the Masorites, who fixed them to the text as they pleased, p. 208. c. 4, in the Contents, and p. 217, 218.

9. That it is lawful for us to change the vowels and accents at our pleasure, p. 250. and 217, 218, 258.

Prolegomena.

of points. They had also the accents, though not expressed by any points, as other Languages, Syriac, Arabic, Latin, English, &c. which have accents observed in punctuation, though not fixed by notes to every syllable, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 49, 47, 53.

8. That the Masorites, when they invented the modern points, (that is, the forms or figures now used,) did not invent any new sounds or pronunciation, nor pointed the Text at their pleasure, but according to the received reading then in use, to facilitate the reading, and take away all ambiguity. This is proved, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 51. according to that reading which was derived to them from the sacred penmen, sect. 53.

9. Though the punctuation be the invention of the Masorites, *et humani juris, quoad apices et figuras*, yet that which is sig-

Considerations.	*Prolegomena.*
	nified by the points, viz. the sound and sense of the words, is altogether of Divine authority, and acknowledges God only for its Author, and ought not to be altered at any man's pleasure, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 51.
10. That the whole credit of our reading and interpretation of Scripture, as far as regulated by the present punctuation, depends only on the faithfulness and skill of those Jews, whose invention this work is asserted to be, p. 157.	10. That our reading depends not upon the Masorites, nor is it therefore true, because it is from them, but because they express in their punctuation the true sense of the Holy Ghost, which was dictated to the holy penmen, and by them committed to writing, and preserved both by Jews and Christians, ibid. *Proleg.* iii. sect. 51.

By these particulars we see the candour of the adversary, and how much the love of the truth, (as he saith, p. 155.) prevailed with him, when, in relating the opinions in the *Prolegomena*, almost every thing is *perverted* or *falsified*; the *Prolegomena* asserting the clean contrary in most things to what he would impose upon them;

which is an evident sign of a bad cause. For as the poet said, Eurip. Phoeniss.

> Ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἄφυ,
> ..... ὁ δ' ἄδικος λόγος
> Νοσεῖ τι δυτῷ, φαιδρύνειν δεῖται σοφῶν.
>
> *The truth is sound, her words are plain,*
> *Falsehood is sick, she needs must feign.*

Besides these, there are divers other things objected against the Various Readings exhibited in the Appendix, against collecting Various Readings out of Translations (though no such be gathered in the Appendix,) about the old Hebrew Character, the knowledge of the Hebrew drawn from the Translation of the Seventy, against the several Translations printed in this edition of the Bible, his consequences on the behalf of Atheists, Papists, &c. in some of which there is something of truth mixed with many untruths and calumnies, as shall appear when we come to handle each by itself.

CHAPTER IV.

I. *The first and main Charge, that the Original Text hath gross corruptions.* II. *Not any words brought out of the Prolegomena to prove this, but consequences of his own. The Prolegomena maintain expressly, that the Originals are not corrupt, either by Jews or others, either before or since Christ; that casual mistakes may happen by negligence in matters of no moment, yet there are means to rectify and amend them when discovered.* III. *The Prolegomena falsified. Various Readings acknowledged by all. Proved out of Bishop Usher, Buxtorf, &c. Granted by the Adversary often, yet sometimes denied in the Hebrew.* VI. *Wherein the Author of the Considerations and the Author of the Prolegomena differ. The Adversary calls all Various Readings corruptions, and so makes the Originals to be corrupt. Various Readings not properly corruptions, proved out of Buxtorf.* VII, VIII. *His arguments against Various Readings.* IX. *Answered. They prove only no wilful corruptions.* X. *The Talmud sometimes reads otherwise than in our Copies, proved by Buxtorf. Of our Saviour's silence about these things.* XI. *The care of the Church in preserving the Copies of the Bible.* XII. XIII. *Whether there be no means of rectifying any error crept in, but only by revelation. That all Copies in public use agree in all saving truth revealed, and in all matters historical, prophetical, &c. of any weight; that other smaller differences may be rectified.* XIV. *All revealed truth comes under our care.* XV. *No one Copy can pretend to be a standard for all others. No vulgar Copy was in possession over all the world before printing or since.* XVI. *The uncertainty of the Adversary's*

rule, viz. That every tittle of revealed truth is in one Copy or other. Impossible to examine all the Copies in the world.

I. We shall begin first with the main charge, viz. That the "Original Texts are corrupted, yea have gross corruptions befallen them." This he propounds sometimes "doubtfully," p. 147. He saith, "the Various Readings at the first view seem to intimate that corruptions have befallen the Originals," and p. 159. "This voluminous bulk of Various Lections, as nakedly exhibited, seems sufficient to beget scruples and doubts about the preservation of the Scripture by the care and providence of God." Now if they do only *intimate*, and *seem to intimate corruptions*, and only *seem sufficient* to beget *scruples*, then they do not *certainly* infer any such charge; and if they *seem* so only at the *first view*, then, upon a *further view*, it may be that they will not *seem to intimate corruptions*. But though he speak thus modestly sometimes, yet in other places he charges home, p. 158. "It is declared (in the *Prolegomena*) that when gross faults or corruptions are befallen the Originals, men may by their faculty of critical conjectures amend them, and restore the native lections that were lost," p. 206. "that where gross faults are crept into the Hebrew Text, men may by their own conjectures find out Various Readings, &c." Epist. p. 21. "Their principle

is, that there are sundry corruptions crept into the Originals, &c. and this receives countenance from these *Prolegomena.*" So p. 311, 325, and in many other places he disputes against this position, as asserted in the *Biblia Polyglotta,* "that the Original Texts are corrupted."

II. But how is this charge proved? Here we may observe, that neither in this nor any other of his other charges doth he relate any of the words of the *Prolegomena;* which if he had done, the falsehood had been discovered. But supposing that the ordinary reader would not trouble himself to look into the *Prolegomena,* but take all upon his word, he substitutes in the place of his adversary's opinion, some of his own consectaries, which to him seemed to follow upon it; which he falls upon with great violence. Which kind of dealing is very unjust, to charge an adversary with consequences, as his proper tenets, when he denies such consequences; especially, when as he directly and not by consequence affirms, and maintains, the contrary to what is charged. Yet this is our case here. What the author of the *Prolegomena* delivered concerning the [M]purity and authority of the Original Texts, is to be seen Proleg. vii. *de Textuum Originalium integritate et auctoritate,* and Proleg. vi. *de Variis Lectionibus;* whither I must refer the reader for full satisfaction. The sum is this, as hath been touched

in part already. 1. *That the Hebrew Text is not corrupted by the Jews either before or after Christ.* This is proved by sundry reasons, and amongst others by these. *That it were against the Providence of God to permit the Scriptures to be corrupted;* and *against the fidelity of the Church, to whose care the sacred Oracles are committed. That the Jews neither did, nor could falsify the Hebrew Text, but that the fraud would have been presently discovered. That it is incredible:* (as Saint Augustine saith, De Civit. l. 13. c. 13. "ipsos voluisse codicibus suis eripere veritatem, ut nobis eriperent auctoritatem, vel in totum orbem dispersos potuisse in hoc conspirare nullo contradicente.") This is at large proved, Proleg. vii. p. 52. and the arguments to the contrary answered. 2. *That neither the Hebrew nor Greek Texts of the Old or New Testament are corrupted by heretics or others, but that they remain pure and entire; and that they always were, and still are, the authentic rule in all matters of faith and religion, and that by them all Translations are to be tried and examined;* to which end many arguments are produced; among others, *that God at the first delivered to the Church, not Translations, but Original Texts, and those pure and free from all corruption; and therefore those that say they are corrupt must prove them so to be, and shew when and*

how they came to be corrupted, and how they came to lose that authority which they once had; otherwise they are to be presumed to be pure and authentic, as being in possession of their authority. Nor can any general corruption be proved from a few particular instances, but only the casual errors of the transcribers, which may well consist with the purity of the fountains. Proleg. 7. sect. 15, 16. 18. 22, 23, &c. 3. *That though by the negligence or inadvertency of transcribers some casual mistakes or involuntary errors may creep into the Text, from whence various Readings have risen both in the Old and New Testament; yet the Original Text remains pure and authentic, because those varieties are not in matters of any moment, whereby any point of faith or salvation is prejudiced in the least; nor are there means wanting whereby such errors may be amended, and the true reading established. That it was not possible that any error should have risen in matters of weight, but it would presently have been discovered, there being so many thousands of Copies dispersed all the world over, which were daily read, expounded, and considered of, and every word weighed and examined, either in public or private, by learned men and others in all ages, who esteemed these Books as the records of their salvation, and the grand charter of their inheritance in heaven;*

and for other mistakes, there are means to rectify them when they are discovered, as the analogy of faith, the writings and comments of the Ancients, collation of ancient Copies, consulting ancient Translations, especially the Scripture itself, the comparing of parallel places, considering antecedents and consequents, &c. That these Various Readings seldom change the sense, or if they do, yet both are agreeable to the analogy of faith; and if, notwithstanding these means, both readings seem equally balanced, there can be no danger, to follow which we will. These things are handled, Proleg. vi. sect. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c. and Proleg. vii. sect. 15, 16, &c.

III. By this it appears what the author of the *Prolegomena* holds about the *purity and authority of the Original Texts.* Now seeing he is charged to deliver the contrary, it may well be expected, that evident proof be brought to shew that he contradicts himself. And what proof is here brought? No words, as I told you before, are alleged, only p. 158. he quotes in the marg. *Proleg.* vii. sect. 12. and *Proleg.* vi. sect. 12. In both which places there is not one word of *corruptions in the Original Text*, much less of *gross corruptions*, or of *correcting them by men's own conjectures*, unless "errata et mendæ leviores" signify *gross corruptions*, and "quæ aliorum codicum et interpretum collatione, aliisque mediis

(de quibus supra) tolli et emendari possunt," do signify *correcting by men's own conjectures.* It is said indeed, *Proleg.* vi. sect. 12. that Various Readings may in some cases be gathered out of ancient Translations; but that this doth not infer the corruption of the present Copies, shall be shewed when we come to that particular. In the mean time, the reader may please to take notice that in the other place (nor indeed any where else) there is not one word of corruptions, nor more said than what all men that will believe their eyes have said before, *That there have been casual mistakes by transcribers in matters of no concernment, or that there are Various Readings in the Hebrew and Greek Texts.* This is proved by the general consent of all, and by sundry instances; and is by our author frequently confessed, as we shall see anon.

IV. For my part I do not know any at this day that is of another opinion. The greatest patrons of the purity of the Hebrew Text grant it without any scruple. The reverend and learned Usher, Epist. ad Cappel. p. 21, [N] writes thus, "Sententia mea hæc perpetua fuit, Heb. Vet. Test. Codicem scribarum erroribus non minus obnoxium esse quàm Novi Codicem, et omnes alios libros, &c." Buxtorf, de Punct. Antiq. part. 1. c. 16. and frequently in his Vindiciæ Textus Hebr. affirms the same. "Non dicam quod Sanctes

Pagninus olim in Præf. Gram. suæ scripsit et dixit, Hebraica volumina nec in una dictione corrupta reperies, neque enim existimo talia esse, ut in nullo particulari punctulo, apiculo, aut litera, à primis Mosis et Prophetarum autographis apographa unquam decesserint, aut nullum omninò vitium vel levissimum in ea irrepserit. Nam ne ipsi quidem Judæi hoc asserunt, qui et antiquitùs jam exemplaria corrupta, sed ab Esdra iterum correcta, et restituta fuisse, et posterioribus temporibus cum inter celebres auctores tum inter exemplaria varia dissensiones et discrepantes quasdam lectiones notant. Tales sunt, præter notas כ״ Keri uketif, dissensiones de quarundam vocum lectione inter Judæos Orientales et Occidentales, et inter Ben Ascher et Ben Naphtali: sic memorant aliquando nec dissimulant varietates nonnullas ex libris quibusdam MSS. celeberrimis et magnæ auctoritatis, ut e. g. librorum Hierosolymitanorum, Babylonicorum, Hispaniensium, Exemplaris Hilleliani, Pentateuchi cujusdam Hierichuntini, Sinaitici, &c. Mentionem etiam faciunt punctatorum, cum in genere, tum nominatim quorundam in specie, R. Moses Londinates, Rabbi Gersom Parisiensis, &c. et dicunt quòd unus seu liber seu punctator vocem hanc sic, alius alitèr, punctet. Monuerunt etiam librorum correctorum, et per consequens minus correctorum. Redarguunt etiam sæpè exemplaria quædam disertè

erroris; sed an propter istas varietates in dubium vocant auctoritatem totius codicis Hebraici, et omnium apographorum? aut an propterea aliqua cum specie, aut aliquo cum fundamento id fieri potuit? Nequaquam."

V. Here, we see, these two learned patrons of the purity of the Hebrew Text affirm as much as is said in the *Prolegomena.* With them concur all others that handle this argument. For though there have been two or three, as Polanus and Pagnine, and some others that have thought the Jewish scribes so privileged, as never to have erred in the least; yet this fancy is generally now exploded by all. Nor shall I need to bring any more witnesses, when the author of these *Considerations* frequently confesses the same. For though sometimes when he was in haste, as p. 180, or in passion, he denies any Various Readings in the Hebrew Text, but grants them in the New Testament, as Epist. p. 27. "Why, I pray, is this so ridiculous? to grant that there are corruptions and Various Readings in the Greek and Latin Copies of the Scripture, but deny it as to the Hebrew? it is founded on no less stable bottom than this experience, that whereas we evidently find Various Lections in the Greek Copies which we enjoy, and so grant that which ocular inspection evinces to be true; yet they are none of them able to shew out of any Copies yet extant in the

world, or that they can make appear ever to have been extant, that ever there were any such Various Lections in the Originals of the Old Testament."—Yet in other places (contradicting himself, which is not unusual,) he frequently grants Various Readings both in the Old and New, p. 13. "It is no doubt, but that in the Copies we now enjoy of the Old Testament there are Diverse Readings. The Keri and Ketib, the Various Lections of Ben Ascher and Ben Naphtali, of the Eastern and Western Jews, which we have collected at the end of the Bible, evince it." p. 178. "Notwithstanding we grant that there are, and have been, Various Lections in the Old Testament and the New, the Keri and Ketib, the Various Readings of Ben Ascher, and Ben Naphtali, the Oriental and Occidental Jews: and if any other can be gathered, or shall hereafter out of any ancient Copies of credit and esteem, where no mistake can be discovered as their cause, they deserve to be considered." p. 190. "That there are in some Copies of the New Testament, and those some of them of good antiquity, Diverse Readings in things or words of less importance is acknowledged." Again, p. 296. "It is known it is granted, that failings have been among them, (the transcribers,) and that Various Readings are from thence risen." And p. 191, "That so many transcriptions should be made without some va-

riation is ἐκ τῶν ἀδυνάτων, &c." Not to add more, Epist. p. 13. "God, by his providence preserving the whole entire, suffered this less variety to fall out in, or among, the Copies we have, for the quickening and exercising of our diligence in our search of his Word;" which is the same which was said before, Proleg. vii. sect. 14. *Potuit quidem Deus omnes librorum sacrorum scriptores vel typographos ἀναμαρτήτους reddere, si ipsi ita visum fuisset, sicut Apostolos et Prophetas Spiritu suo gubernavit, ut in eorum autographis nullum esset erratum. At sicut Ecclesiæ doctores omnes erroribus obnoxios esse voluit, licet primos Ecclesiæ proceres ab omni errore immunes reddidit, ut scilicet omnes excitaret ad diligentem usum mediorum, quibus Veritas Divina conservari posset; sic dicendum de exemplaribus, apographis, mendis, et erroribus levioribus, quæ fidei et moribus non officerent, obnoxia esse voluit, ut diligentiam nostram in codicum sacrorum puritate conservanda exerceret; nam vigilantibus et non dormientibus Deus succurrit, et opera ac ministerio hominum uti decrevit ad oraculorum suorum conservationem, &c.*

VI. Thus we see how our Author affirms the same thing himself, which he finds fault with in another; neither do I know wherein there is any real difference, or more said in this matter by the *Prolegomena* than is granted in the *Considera-*

tions, excepting only in that of collecting Various Readings out of some Translations; from which we shall shew in its proper place, that nó corruption of the Original Texts can be inferred. And herein our author differs not only from the author of the *Proleg.* but from all or most divines and expositors whatsoever. Those *Various Readings, which the Proleg. affirm may be sometimes gathered out of Translations*, are of the same nature with these which the *Considerator grants may be gathered out of Original Copies*, viz. of no weight, containing nothing repugnant to the analogy of faith; and further are not asserted to be of equal authority or certainty with those that are gathered out of the Hebrew and Greek Texts: and therefore the present reading of the Original Copies ought not, barely upon the different reading of a Translation, to be judged corrupt; as we shall shew when we come to that charge. But if our author will needs have all Various Readings, though the difference be never so small, to be corruptions of the Text, he may call them so, if he pleaseth; I cannot hinder him. Yet he might learn of Buxtorf, whose authority he hath no reason to question, to distinguish between Various Readings and Corruptions, properly so called, Vindic. Textus Hebr. Part. 1. c. 4. p. 112. "Porrò omninò, ut suprà monui, differentiam faciendam censeo inter Corruptionem et Variam Lectionem."

Corruption is properly a wilful falsifying upon design; as where heretics wilfully falsified some places of Scripture, which made against their error, such were quickly discovered. And that no such are in our Copies, is acknowledged. But a Various Reading is an involuntary error from mistake, or inadvertency, which is always in matters of little moment, and therefore not so easily at first discerned; and having passed through many Copies not observed, nor being contrary to the circumstances of the Text, or repugnant to any other place of Scripture, so that it cannot be clearly proved which may be the mistake of the scribe, it comes to be in the number of Various Readings. For the differences of any Copy, when they can be clearly proved to have been at first errors of the scribe, are not properly Various Readings; as is confessed in the *Prolegomena* vi. sect. 6. But if our Adversary will needs call Various Readings corruptions, he shall give me leave to call such corruptions Various Readings; and the rather, because I do no where in the *Prolegomena* grant Corruptions, but acknowledge only Various Readings. And he must know withal, that hereby he makes himself guilty of that crime which he would fasten upon others, and by the Apostle's sentence, Rom. ii. 1. is unexcusable; being condemned by himself, by granting the Original Texts to be

corrupt, because he grants Various Readings as well as others. And upon this account, all Copies that are, or ever have been, (the autographa of the sacred Penmen only excepted,) must be said to be corrupt; because no scribes or printers ever had a privilege of not erring, and so all their failings, though never so small, must make the Text corrupt. And as the Originals, so all Versions, by this reason must be corrupt; and so there will be no Scripture in the world, but what is corrupt and uncertain; and, by consequence, unfit for a ground of faith or obedience. For, as Buxtorf saith, Vindic. Part. I. c. iv. p. 67. "Facilè potuit error unius exemplaris corrigi ex alio meliore, et tandem emendatum satis exemplar cudi, licèt non ad extremum usque apicem, (istud enim facilè concedo, nec esse, nec fuisse, imo nec esse posse.") And Vindic. Part. II. c. xii. p. 800. he saith, The Scripture is so preserved, "ut nulla, vel paucissima alicujus momenti σφάλματα, in iis demonstrare possint." He that saith, there are *paucissima alicujus momenti*, grants that there are *some that are of moment;* which is more than the *Prolegomena* do any where affirm. And in the same place he adds, "Libros sacros à Mosis, Prophetarum, et Esdræ, temporibus ad nos usque, sine ulla lectionis varietate pervenisse, quia nullibi asserimus, nulla etiam ratione probatio à nobis exigi potest." With these learned men con-

cur, [O] Arnol. Bootius, a fierce defender of the Hebrew Text against Cappellus, Epist. ad Usserium, sect. 64. and in his Vindic. Hebr. cap. xxiii. p. 221. where he affirms our present Copies to agree with the first *αυτογραφα*, but excepts two cases, "Præterquam in duobus casibus modo memoratis, ubi, vel de vitio, vel de varia lectione, apertissimè constat."

VII. Our Adversary, notwithstanding, proceeds upon this supposed charge, (of which himself is most guilty,) to prove that which is not denied; nay, which was before proved to his hand, *Prolegomena* vii. where also the arguments to the contrary are answered: where the reader, if he please, may find the chief arguments used in the *Considerations*, with some others by him omitted, to prove that the Original Texts are not corrupted; so that I might spare both my own and the reader's further trouble, and say nothing more upon the point. But because they are urged in the *Considerations*, to prove that there could be no Variations in any Copies, not in the least; and, by consequence, that there can be no Various Readings; we will take a brief view of them.

VIII. Chap. ii. p. 168, 169, &c. — 181. He objects, "the special providence of God; the care and fidelity of the Church;" *(not the Romish synagogue;)* "the care of the first writers giving

out authentic copies, which made it impossible for them to be corrupted, either wilfully or by negligence; the public Copies preserved in the Synagogues, and after in the Churches; the daily reading, studying, and weighing every word; the weight of every letter in this book, which the transcribers knew to be the Word of the great God, &c.; the care of Ezra and his companions; the care of the Masorites and Jewish rabbins, giving an account of every word and syllable; the prodigious things related of their diligence; the consent of all Copies of the world, that not a word in the Mishna, Gemara, or either Talmud, is read otherwise than in our Copies; our Saviour's silence not reproving the Jews on this account, when he spared them not for their false glosses, which secures us, that there were no mistakes voluntarily, or negligently brought into the Text before his coming; the watchfulness of the Jews and Christians over one another, &c."— All which, as they prove the Text not to be wilfully corrupted, and that not any errors of consequence could creep in by negligence, to which end the most of these reasons are brought in the *Prolegomena*; so they do not in the least prove, but that by the negligence or inadvertency of transcribers some small mistakes of no moment might escape undiscerned, (and so are nothing at all to our Author's purpose.) Of which we can

have no clearer argument, than the experience of all ages; that notwithstanding all the care and diligence that could be used, yet Various Readings have been still observed in the best Copies, which must needs come at first from the negligence, or involuntary error, of the scribe; as is confessed frequently by this author himself, and by all others that write of these things: so that to prove this, were to hold up a candle to the sun. We have more Copies of the Bible now, than ever were in any age; and more that pretend to the knowledge of it. For, as S. Jerom, Epist. ad Paulinum, "Scripturæ ars est quam omnes sibi vendicant." And printing is a surer way to prevent errors than transcribing by far; and yet have many errors daily escaped in printing the Bibles, and those undiscerned; many passing for current, many years not observed; and some of them altering the sense.

IX. The multitude of Copies, public and private, and of all such that studied and read them, might rather prove the Greek LXX. which was in more frequent use than the Hebrew, both among Jews and Christians, to have been free from all error, than the Original Texts; and so the Vulgar Latin, the Syriac, and other Translations, of which were many thousand more Copies, and those studied, and read by thousands more than the Hebrew; yet I know our author

will not grant that they were Translations free from all error, for he inveighs against them all as most corrupt, Cap. ult. Our printers also know, as well as the transcribers did of old, the weight and worth of what they print; and yet we know they are not free from error. The care taken amongst the Jews, from time to time, to get corrected Copies, by which others were examined, shews that there were still Copies that needed correction. What needed Ben Ascher, or Ben Naphtali, or R. Hillel, or others, to have taken such pains, and spent so many years, in the accurate writing of one Copy, if errors had not still crept into other Copies?

X. That of the Mishna and Gemara, (which are the integral parts of both the Talmuds, the one being as the Text, and the other as the Comment, and yet distinguished here from the Talmuds,) that they never read one word otherwise than they are in our Copies, is utterly *void of truth,* though repeated, p. 271. Witness Buxtorf himself, (one that I believe, is more versed in the Talmud than either of us,) Vindic. l. 2. c. xii. p. 808. "Publicè dico et scribo, inveniri quidèm in Talmud, quòd Gemara in quibusdam locis dissentiat à Masora, hoc est, à lectione in nostris codicibus recepta, &c." This cannot stand with our Adversary's rash assertion, nor would it have been granted by Buxtorf to Cappellus, if it had not

been certainly true. The argument from our Saviour's silence was brought, *Prolegomena* vii. to prove that the Original Texts were not corrupted before his coming; the end of whose coming was not to correct every letter or word that was mistaken in any Copy of the Bible, but to assert the true sense against the corrupt glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees, and to restore it to its original integrity, if any wilful corruptions had been, or errors of any moment, which might have endangered the saving truth; of which kind we say there are none; nay, so far were our Saviour and his Apostles from observing every casual slip of a scribe in Hebrew Copies, that they [P] made more frequent use of the Greek LXX. than the Hebrew, and quoted places out of the Old Testament according to that Translation, even where there seems to be some difference from the Hebrew, and left that Translation to the Christian Church, who used it generally for many hundred years, as the Greek Church doth to this day; as is largely shewed, *Prolegomena* ix. de Græcis Versionibus, sect. 38, 39, &c.

XI. But besides these reasons mentioned, chap. ii. of the *Considerations*, we find some others scattered here and there, which we will briefly examine, p. 168, 169. "He finds fault with the arguing from the oscitancy and negligence of transcribers of heathen authors, Homer, Aristotle,

&c. to shew that errors might creep into the Original Texts." This, he saith, "is not tolerable in a Christian, or any one that hath the least sense of the nature and importance of the Word of God." He urges likewise, "the care of the heathen about their Sybils' verses," p. 171. "that the Roman Pontifices would not do it negligently nor treacherously, &c." *Answer:* It is not denied, but that the Church of Christ had a religious care, that the Copies transcribed for public use especially, should be free from all errors, as much as could be; and that far more care was taken about them, than ever was taken by any about the writings of the heathen; nor do I know any who affirm the contrary. It is true, this argument is used by some, that the Various Readings in such authors, in matters of less moment, do not make all their Philosophy, Histories, &c. uncertain; and therefore the like Various Readings in some Copies of the Scripture, do not make the Scripture uncertain, or prove it to be corrupt. But what is this to the care and fidelity of the Church in preserving the Copies of the Scripture, which all acknowledge to be more than any had, or could have, in preserving any human writings, the Sybils' verses, or any other of the heathen's pretended oracles? But though their care was great, and therefore no wilful errors could pass, nor mistakes in any matter of con-

cernment; yet that they did never err, not in the least, needs no other confutation, than the comparing of all Copies, MSS. or printed, which have had errors of this kind, more or less, according to the diligence and care of the scribe or corrector, as ocular inspection demonstrates.

XII. Again, p. 17, 18, &c. he tells us, "the relief provided by Cappellus, and approved in the *Prolegomena*, against Various Lections, viz. That the saving doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the substance of it, in all things of moment, is preserved in the Copies of the Original, and in the Translations that remain,—is pernicious and insufficient; because, though it be a great relief against inconvenience of Translations, that the worst of them contains all necessary saving fundamental truth, yet to depress the sacred truth of the Original into such a condition, as wherein it should stand in need of such an apology, and that without any colour or pretence from discrepance in the Copies themselves that are extant, or any tolerable evidence that ever there were any other in the least differing from these extant in the world, will at length be found a work unbecoming a Christian Protestant Divine.—The nature of this doctrine is such, that there is no other principle or means of discovery, no other rule or measure of judging and determining any thing about it, but only the writing from whence it is

taken, it being wholly of Divine revelation, which is only expressed in Scripture; so that, upon supposal of any corruption there is no means of rectifying it, as there is in correcting a mistake in any problem of Euclid, &c. Nor is it enough to satisfy us, that the doctrines above mentioned are preserved entire; every tittle or ἰωτα of the Word of God must come under our care and consideration."—He provides us therefore better security, p. 198. He tells us of "a Copy which was a standard to try all others by. The Vulgar Copy we use was the public possession of many generations; and, upon the invention of printing, it was in actual possession throughout the world. This must pass for a standard, which confessedly is its right and due." But p. 173. we are referred to all the Copies that are remaining; in them all, we say, is every letter and tittle of the Word of God: these Copies are the rule, standard, and touchstone, of all Translations, &c."

XIII. For answer: First, for what Cappellus affirms, I am not bound to answer. He was able enough to answer for himself while he was living; and now he is dead, every one will trample upon a dead lion, who durst not look him in the face while he was alive. But as for the *Prolegomena*, I do not only say, that all saving fundamental truth is contained in the Original Copies, but that all revealed truth is still remaining entire; or

if any error or mistake have crept in, it is in matters of no concernment, so that not only no matter of faith, but no considerable point in historical truth, prophecies, or other things, is thereby prejudiced; and that there are means left for rectifying any such mistakes where they are discovered, as hath been often said. Secondly, to say, that, upon any corruption in the saving doctrine supposed, there is no means of rectifying or restoring, is a very strange assertion. May not the consideration of antecedents and consequents, of places parallel, of the analogy of faith, the testimonies, expositions, and translations of the ancients, &c. help to rectify a corruption crept in? And may we not judge by one part of revealed truth of what agrees with it, or disagrees from it, as by any theorem of Euclid, what is agreeable with it, or disagreeable, though the one be by reason, the other by revelation? Is there no use of reason in matters of faith? or in judging of Divine truths? Vedelius might have spared his labour of a Rationale, if this be so. It is confessed by all, that Various Readings are found in the Original Texts, which several readings cannot both be from the sacred penmen, but the one must needs be false and erroneous. And if in such smallest things, (all being of Divine revelation, the least as well as the weightiest,) no way can be found to rectify any

mistake without a new revelation, the Scriptures are in an ill condition; for by this means no error, once got in, can ever be amended or corrected.

XIV. Nor is it any where said in the *Prolegomena*, that there is any corruption in any fundamental truth crept into the Original Copies, or in any saving doctrine, whereby it may need rectifying or restoring; nay, the contrary is both maintained and proved; yea, that in no matter of moment there is any variety in the Copies. And though we grant lesser varieties to appear, (which is confessed by all,) yet we deny not, but that every tittle of the Word, though never so small, comes under our care, and ought not to be neglected. But for all the care we can use, such lesser varieties will happen, which being involuntary, and of little or no importance to the sense or matter, neither the providence of God is there prejudiced, nor the care of the Church to be called in question.

XV. But what better security gives he against the uncertainty arising from these varieties? To make one Copy a standard for all others, in which no mistake in the least can be found, he cannot. No Copy can plead this privilege since the first ἀντίγραφα were in being. So it is confessed by Buxtorf and Bootius, his best authors. Nor can he tell us where this Copy is to be found to

which we must have recourse, and in which every tittle is entire and perfect. Some Copies there have been more correct than others, which deserve all due regard. But to find one that is free from all mistakes, even in the least, he will find a hard task; yea, Buxtorf grants it impossible, as we have seen. What that Vulgar Copy was, which, before printing was invented, was in possession all the world over for many generations, and must pass for a standard, I would gladly know, and where it is to be found; and should very much esteem it, if it could be shewed; but this, I doubt, will prove an Utopian conceit. For doth our Adversary think there was no difference in the Copies that were in use before printing? the collation of all MSS. Copies shews this to be false. Let him produce any two that are the same in every thing. Or doth he think, that those that first printed the Hebrew and Greek Text had only one Copy, and did not collate divers of the best they could find, or that there is no difference in the printed Copies, I mean, not typographical errors, but such as were in the Copies which they followed? If any such standard were in being, surely we have it printed in some Edition of the Bible. Is it, for the Hebrew Text, the Venice Edition? and if so, which of those Editions? or Munster's, or Stephanus's, or the Regia, or Plantine's, or which of these? And for the Greek,

let him declare whether it be Erasmus's Edition, or the Complutense, or Stephens's, or Beza's, or which it is. For that there are varieties and differences among them all, is evident, and cannot be denied. Neither let him say, the differences be of no moment; for this is said in the *Prolegomena,* with which he is not satisfied. This, therefore, which he tells us of a Copy which must be a standard for all others in every thing, and was in possession all the world over, is a meer chimera, a groundless fancy, and a vain imagination of that which never was since the ἀντίγραφα were in being.

XVI. But if he fly to his other refuge, and say, that in all the Copies extant, that is, in some one or other, every the least iota and tittle is to be found, then we are left more uncertain. For then we must have all the Copies that are any where throughout the world, and must compare them all together before we can find all the entire truth of God; for if we want but one Copy, there may be something in that which differs from the rest, and so we can have no certainty in the rest. Now all men know this to be impossible to get together all Copies whatsoever, and never to be expected; and therefore, upon this ground, it is impossible to attain any certainty about all and every tittle of the Word of God. Or suppose

we had all the Copies extant in the world, and could compare them together; yet, where they differ, how shall we, by any directions he gives us, know which Copy is right in this particular, and which in that? These ways, then, which he propounds being invalid and insufficient, I appeal to any whether it be not more satisfactory, to say that we have all saving truth preserved in the Copies, which are in common and public use in the Church of Christ; and that they are free from all errors in matters of moment; and that in other matters there are ways and means to judge of the best reading and what is most genuine, wherein our industry is to be used; and if there be some places wherein both readings render the sense so that we cannot tell which to prefer, (both being agreeable to the analogy of faith, and neither of them repugnant to any other place of Scripture,) that there is no danger to choose which we will; and whether there be any such danger in this assertion as is pretended? Our Author himself confesses, p. 300. that "in some of the Keries and Ketibs there is a difference in the sense, yea that some have quite contrary significations, as לֹא and אֵת which occur fourteen or fifteen times;" and yet he salves all with this, that "neither of them is contrary to the analogy of faith." If this be sufficient for *some Various*

Readings, why may it not be so for *the rest?* This, and less than this, he confesses is enough for *Translations.* And why this, which we have laid down, may not serve for the *Originals,* I cannot see; seeing the people's faith is immediately guided by *Translations,* and not one of a thousand understands the *Originals.*

CHAPTER V.

I. *The second Charge; that we say, that our present Copies are not the same with those anciently used.* II. *The Prolegomena affirm and prove that our Copies are the same.* III. *Various Readings gathered out of Translations do not prove the contrary.* IV. *That all Books whatsoever, except the first* Αυτόγραφα, *are subject to Various Readings, yet the same Books.* V. *All differences of a Translation from the Original are not Various Readings.* VI. *A third Charge, that the same Fate hath attended the Scripture with other Books: this a pure Calumny.* VII. *Archbishop Usher, Buxtorf, and others, say the same with the Prolegomena.* VIII. *The Prolegomena often acknowledge God's special providence over these Books.* IX. *A fourth Charge, that we may correct the Original upon conjectures, proved a calumny out of the Adversary's words.* X. *The Prolegomena expressly maintain the contrary.*

I. We proceed now to his other charges. The next is, "That we say, that our present Copies are not the same with those anciently used," p. 206. "That the old Translators had other Copies or differing Copies from them which we now enjoy," p. 311. "which did really differ from those we now enjoy and use," and Epist. p. 10. "which are utterly lost." This, though in a manner coincident with the former, is yet distinctly propounded; and so we shall distinctly handle it. It

is indeed so gross a calumny, that the Author of it confesses, p. 312. "that he doth not remember that the *Prolegomena* do any where expressly affirm, that they of old had other Copies than those we now enjoy," and therefore he would gather it by consequence from some other position maintained in the *Prolegomena*. And what is that? viz. the *Prolegomena* affirm, *that Various Readings may sometimes be gathered out of some ancient Translations*; which the Adversary thus expresses very untruly, as we shall shew anon; "that by the help and use of Translations conjecturing how they read in their books, either with other words or letters, consonants or points, we may collect Various Lections, as out of the Original; which opinion he sees not how upon the matter it differs from that of Cappellus."

II. I answer, first: Not to question how truly he charges Cappellus, who no where that I know affirms this, but rather deprecates it as a calumny; whereas he saith he could not remember that the *Prolegomena* do any where expressly say, that they had other Copies of old, he could not but remember where they expressly say yea, &c. *Prolegomena* vii. sect. 16. (which, p. 146. he saith he hath looked through.) There, as we have already noted, it is proved *that the Copies we now have are the true transcripts of the* ἀντίγραφα *of the Prophets and Apostles, and the very same;*

and therefore here we have another proof of our Author's candour and sincerity, imposing upon his adversary as his proper tenets his own illogical consequence, when he knew that his adversary directly and not by consequence maintains the contrary. But this is familiar with him, to deduce any odious consequence from his adversary's assertion, which he never goes about to prove, because it cannot be proved; but takes it for granted, and upon that disputes against his adversary, when as indeed he fights with his own shadow.

III. What is held in the *Prolegomena* about gathering Various Readings sometimes out of Translations, shall be discussed in its due place. At present I do utterly deny his consequence. For whereas all the Various Readings of any Copies are maintained to be only in matters of no weight or concernment, and such as were at first casual errors or mistakes of transcribers, as is already shewed; and that those, that may be gathered out of Translations, are of the same nature and quality; if this be sufficient to prove that our Copies are not the same, then those that are likewise gathered out of the Originals, or have been, as the Keri and Ketib, and the like, (which are admitted by our Author,) will likewise prove that we have not the same Copies of the Originals.

IV. Nay, if this argument be sufficient, then it

will prove that we have no true Copies of any books in the world; for there were never any yet, (except the holy penmen,) which have been so privileged, that the transcriber could not err, or that Various Readings, after frequent transcriptions, might not be gathered. Then farewell not only Scripture, but all other monuments either of divine or human learning: Then we have no true Copies of the writings of any of the Fathers, Commentators, Councils, nor of any authors of Philosophy, Law, Physic, Mathematics, History, &c. but all the old and genuine Copies are lost, and those we have are corrupt, spurious, and false; and so the foundation of all divine and human learning is at once quite taken away! Buxtorf, as I have shewed, and others the most rigid defenders of the Hebrew Text, maintain that our present Copies are the same with the first ἀυτόγραφα, and yet stick not to confess that they agree not in every thing, but that there may be some variation in smaller matters; yea, that they should agree in every tittle, Buxtorf saith it is impossible. I would fain know what it is, that makes a Copy not to be the same with the Original? Must there not be some substantial difference, and that in matters of weight and importance that must make such a change? Shall every difference of a word or a letter, it may be once in nine or ten pages, work this

strange metamorphosis? Who ever affirmed such paradoxes? Is not a man the same individuum, when his hair is cut or his nails pared, that he was before, nay though his skin be scratched or some blood drawn? Why then is not a Copy the same with the Original, though there be some small difference in things not concerning the sum or substance of the book? Are not our Statute-books and Acts of Parliament, now printed, the same with the Original Copies, though the writers or printers be not infallible, but it may be have in some words or letters of no concernment, by casual mistake, varied from the Originals? Besides this, doth not our Adversary grant, that errors and casual mistakes have happened in matters of less moment, from whence Various Readings are sprung, which by his own logic should make the Copies not to be the same?

V. But from whence doth he draw this conclusion? From this: "that by the help and use of Translations conjecturing how they read in their books, either with other words or letters, consonants or points, we may collect Various Readings, as out of the Original." But this is most *partially* and *untruly* by him propounded, and no where affirmed in the *Prolegomena*. For 1. as we have already said, all differences of a Translation from the Original are not to be reckoned among Various Readings. *Proleg.* vi. sect. 8. 11. *The*

mistakes of the translator, his paraphrastical expositions, adding or omitting some words which he judged needful or needless to the sense, the errors of the scribe, &c. must be accurately distinguished from the Various Readings; but when no probable cause can be given why the translator so rendered some places, save the ambiguity of some words for want of points, or the affinity of some letters in form or sound, or transposition of a letter, or the like, (in which cases a change may easily happen,) there we may well gather that the Copies varied, and that the translator read the words so in his Copy, as they are by him rendered. Nor 2. do we say, that they always read with *other letters or words, consonants or points; for this might infer that all differences of Translations are from the difference of Copies, because all consist in other letters or words; but when the letters are alike in figure or sound, or there is only a metathesis of the same letters, or ambiguity of a word without points, a mistake might easily happen in the Copies.* Nor 3. do we say, *we may gather the Various Readings, as out of the Originals; for there is an express difference made between those gathered out of the Originals, and those out of Translations; and of these it is said,* Proleg. vi. sect. 8. *Non pari certitudinis gradu incedere; they are not of the*

same certainty with the other: so that we see herein is nothing true either in the premises or in the conclusion. I leave therefore this consideration; wishing he would hereafter consider better what he writes.

VI. In the third place, he charges us with saying, "That the same fate hath attended the Scripture in its transcription, as hath done other books," p. 173. and p. 206. "That the Books of Scripture have had the fate of other books, by passing through the hands of many transcribers." For this he refers to *Prol.* vii. sect. 12. but never cites the words; and yet adds, p. 173. "This imagination, asserted upon deliberation, seems to me to border upon atheism: surely the promise of God for preservation of his Word, with his love and care of his Church, of whose faith and obedience that Word is the rule, requires other thoughts at our hands!" In this we find the like truth and candour as in the rest: For, first, he makes us to speak that of the Scripture in general, which is only spoken of one particular; wilfully leaving out that (as he knows who did of old) which would have proved all to be a pure calumny. The words are, *Nam in hisce sacra volumina idem fatum cum aliis libris subiisse præsertim antiquis, et sæpius descriptis, experientia planè testatur. Hoc à nemine hodiè apertè negari video, &c. In hisce,* in these things, that is, to

be subject to *errata et mendæ leviores*, by negligence of transcribers, that is, to Various Readings. Is this the same, as to say, that God's providence extends no more to the preservation of these books than of all others, which the *Prolegomena* are so far from affirming, as is here suggested, that the contrary is both in the same place, and elsewhere, frequently maintained?

VII. The words precedent are, *Etsi textus originarii non sint à Judæis, vel aliis, studiosè corrupti, sed in omnibus quæ ad fidem et mores spectant puri et incorrupti; tamen scribarum incuria, vel temporum injuria, in textus originarios errata quædam et mendas leviores irrepere potuisse, et irrepsisse negari non potest, quæ aliorum codicum et interpretum collatione, aliisque mediis (de quibus supra) tolli et emendari possunt. Nam in hisce sacra volumina idem fatum cum aliis subiisse*, &c. What is more said here than was said by all others before, that have written of Various Readings? Buxtorf, Sixtin Amama, and others, whose words are brought in the same *Prolegomena* vi. de Variis Lectionibus, say the same. It shall suffice, to note the words of the reverend and learned Usher, there also quoted, Epist. ad Lud. Cappel. p. 21. "Sententia mea hæc perpetua fuit, Hebræum V. Testamenti Codicem scribarum erroribus non minus obnoxium esse quàm Novi Codicem, et omnes,

alios libros," What difference is there between the *Prolegomena* and the words of this reverend primate? And doth not the *Considerator* himself say the same thing, when he grants Various Readings in the Original Texts, which, he also saith, came from the failings and mistakes of the scribes?

VIII. As for God's special providence in preservation of these books, the denial whereof, he saith, borders upon atheism, he might have read in the same *Prolegom.* vi. sect. 15. that though there be such differences in some small matters of no consequence, *ita tamen invigilavit providentia Divina, Ecclesiæque diligentia, ut in iis quæ ad salutem necessaria sunt, et ad fidem et mores spectant, omnia pura et integra sint.* And sect. 3. in the same *Prolegomena* are cited the words of the learned Bochartus in that admirable work of his, Geogr. Sacr. Part I. lib. ii. c. 13. who, after he had said the same, with the *Prolegomena*, of Various Readings in the Scripture, as in other books, and that they do not infer any uncertainty, as some men fear, adds, *Quamvis exemplum sit valdè dispar, nam multo alitèr invigilavit providentia Divina, ut sacros Scripturæ Codices præstaret immunes*, &c. Thus we see in the same place which the Adversary alleges to make good his charge, the contrary directly proved; which he could not choose but observe;

and therefore what honesty or fair dealing can be expected from him in other matters, who hath so wilfully erred in this, let the reader judge. I doubt not but that he hath read the *Preface to the Bible:* there he might have observed the publisher's words, p. 1. *Etsi autem in Librorum sacrorum conservatione Ecclesiæ opera usus sit Deus, tamen speciali providentia ita eis invigilavit, ut ab ipso primo inspiratos esse admiranda ipsorum conservatione monstravit, dum Divina hæc fidei speique nostræ monumenta tantis munivit præsidiis, ut per tot seculorum decursus, inter tot imperiorum ruinas, tot regnorum mutationes et* κατακλύσμους, *inter tot librariorum transcriptiones exemplaribus inter nationes dispersis, tanta terræ marisq; intercapedine disjunctas, contra hæreticorum fraudes et tyrannorum furores, qui ea vel corrumpere vel abolere conati sunt, sarta tecta ad nostra tempora conservata, et ad ultimum temporis articulum permansura sint.* I appeal to all men, even to the adversary himself, what could be said more fully concerning God's admirable preservation of these books, and whether he hath not abused the reader and publisher in this crimination. The publisher wrote upon deliberation, and need not retract any thing. I wish his Adversary had as well considered what he hath charged him with, for then the labour of both might have been spared.

IX. The ninth thing charged upon the *Prolegomena*, is p. 206. "That when gross faults crept into the Hebrew Text, men may by their own conjectures find out Various Readings;" and p. 159. "it is declared, that where any gross faults or corruptions are befallen the Originals, men may by their faculty of critical conjecturing amend them, and restore the native lections that are lost, though in general without the authority of Copies this be not allowed." For this he quotes, *Prolegom.* vii. sect. 12. I see our Author is still *semper idem;* a thread of untruth and calumny runs through the whole book; yet in this, of gathering Various Readings upon mere conjectures, he is less excusable than in some of the rest; not only because this whole charge is plainly rejected and disproved in *Prolegom.* vi. sect. ult. and reasons are given why it cannot be allowed; but also because the adversary acquits the author of the *Prolegomena* of it in other places, and acknowledges the same with thanks. For within two leaves he writes, p. 209. "Indeed, I do not find his (Cappellus's) boldness in conjecturing approved in the *Prolegomena.*" Why do you then charge them with it? you might have said, you found it rejected and disproved. Again, p. 305. "That they (Keri and Ketib) are most of them critical amendments of the rabbins, is not allowed" *(by the Prolegomena)* "for

which latter part of his determination we thank the learned Author," p. 307. "In the mean time, I cannot but rejoice that Cappellus's fancy about these things," *(about conjecturing)* "than which I know nothing more pernicious to the truth of God, is not allowed." Thus you see we are accused and acquitted by the same pen.

X. But yet, for proof, he refers us to *Prolegomena* vii. sect. 12. where I desire the reader to see if there be one word, either of gross faults, or of amending by conjectures; unless, as I said before, *errata et mendæ leviores* do signify gross faults, *et quæ ex aliis codicibus aliisque mediis de quibus supra emendari possunt,* do signify the amendment of them by men's own conjectures. Lastly, in that, p. 159. now cited, it may be observed, that he confutes his charge in the propounding of it; for he saith, this way of correcting upon conjectures in general, without the authority of Copies, is not allowed of; which is a plain confutation of itself; for none ever denied, but that errors in one Copy might be corrected by other Copies; and how then are they to be found out and corrected by men's own conjectures? But thus he variously relates the opinion of his adversary, that either he might make his opinion hateful to his unwary reader, who haply might not read both places, or else that he

might have a starting hole, if he should be challenged for *falsifying*, saying, that in another place he related all truly; and yet that relation is no less contradictory to itself, than the other is false: for to restore a reading by mere conjectures, and to restore it by another Copy, is a plain contradiction.

CHAPTER VI.

I. *The fifth Charge, that we may gather Various Readings out of Translations, aggravated by the Adversary and odiously propounded.* II. *Nothing affirmed in the Prolegomena, but what most Protestants, Divines, and Commentators say.* III. *Four Uses of Translations expressed in the Prolegomena.* IV. *The present Reading is in possession of its authority.* V. *Translations not equalled to the Original, but subservient to them: Of correcting the Word of God.* VI. *To correct an error crept into the Original, is not to correct the Original.* VII. *Translations useful when any doubt ariseth about the true Reading. The present Reading not to be altered merely upon a Various Reading of a Translation.* VIII. *In what Case Various Readings may be gathered out of a Translation.* IX. *Such Various Readings not of equal authority with those gathered out of the Originals.* X. *Various Readings out of Translations are not in matters of weight.* XI. *That Various Readings may be gathered out of Translations, proved by ancient and modern Divines, and those great assertors of the purity of the Originals.* XII. *The words of Reverend Usher.* XIII. *Proved by divers instances undeniable.* XIV. *and* XV. *The Adversary's boldness, affirming there never was any Copy differing in the least from the present, disproved at large, contradicted by himself.* XVI. *The Keri and Ketib, what they are.* XVII. *The sixth Charge, that Keri and Ketib are critical Notes of the Rabbins, shewed to be false.* XVIII. *What the Prolegomena deliver about the Original; that the most are Various Readings gathered*

out of ancient Hebrew Copies. XIX. *The Adversary clears the Prolegomena from his own Charge.* XX. *He is not at leisure to prove their divine Original.* XXI. *Concerning the Notes out of Grotius.* XXII. *His great Worth and Learning.* XXIII. *The Reason of collecting these Notes out of him; not as specimina of Various Readings by Conjectures, of which scarce one or two in the Pentateuch; the most are Various Readings out of Greek Copies of the Old Testament. The Publisher not bound to assert all that is said by him, or any other, in their Notes exhibited in the Appendix.*

I. The fifth charge, which is that Gorgon's head, which so much *affrighted* our Adversary, as he saith, Epist. p. 19. and *startled* him, p. 146. is, "the gathering of Various Readings out of Translations;" and that, as he saith, Epist. p. 25. "when there is no difference in the Copies." This he frequently ingeminates, p. 158, and 206, 314, 311. This he makes "as pernicious a principle as ever was fixed upon by any learned man, since the foundation of the Church of Christ," Epist. p. 21. "excepting those of Rome." And upon this position, and that of the novelty of punctuation, he must needs cry out, δὸς πῦ στῶ, "as not seeing any means of being delivered from utter uncertainty in and about all sacred truth," p. 25. Hence are those tragical exclamations, fearful outcries "of correcting the Original by the help of Translations," p. 311. "of printing the Originals, and defaming them, gathering up Trans-

lations of all sorts, and setting them up in competition with them," Epist. p. 9. " of advancing Translations unto an equality with the Originals, and setting them by it, and with it upon even terms; yea, using them as means of amending and altering the Originals; which is to set up an altar of our own by the altar of God, and to equal the wisdom, care, skill, and diligence of men, with the wisdom, care, and providence of God," p. 174. " of horrible and outragious violence offered to the sacred Hebrew verity by learned mountebanks," p. 315. " This is to correct the Scripture," p. 344. " To correct the Word of God," p. 180. " To amend it at the pleasure of men," p. 347. " Of dreadful distemper, which may prove mortal to the truth of the Scripture," p. 314. And therefore he wishes, " that all Translations were consumed out of the earth, rather than this one figment should be admitted," p. 221.

II. One would think that reads these passages, that all religion lay at the stake; that some strange new doctrine were delivered never heard of before, which at once would overthrow the whole foundation of Christianity: when as it will appear upon the matter, that nothing is said in the *Prolegomena* more than what the best and learnedest Protestant Divines, and, in a manner, all Commentators have said and practised before, and those the greatest assertors of the Hebrew

verity; and that the gathering of Various Readings out of Translations was never absolutely by any denied before.

III. What the *Prolegomena* do affirm concerning the use of Translations the reader may see. *Prolegom.* v. De Versionibus Scripturæ. Where it is proved out of Theodoret, Jerom, Chrysostom, and others, that, in the first and purest times of the Church, the Bible was translated into most Vulgar Languages; the Egyptian, Persian, Indian, Armenian, Scythian, Syriac, Ethiopic, Gothic, &c. besides the Greek and Latin. And concerning the use and benefit of Translations, it is reduced to these heads: First, because all cannot understand the Original Tongues; therefore Translations serve as so many pipes or channels to convey those living waters of salvation from the fountains to every particular nation and people, that so all may read and hear the wonderful works of God in their own tongue. Secondly, the wonderful [Q] consent of all Translations in all things of moment, though made at several times, and in several nations so far distant from one another, joined together only by the same common faith, proves these Books to be of Divine Original, and to have no other author but God, who so wonderfully preserved them, among so many changes and revolutions, against the fury and malice of

Satan, and all his instruments, persecuting tyrants, and subtil heretics and sectaries, who laboured either to corrupt or abolish the same. Thirdly, they bear witness to the integrity of the Original Texts, by their consent and harmony therewith, as is shewed in divers particulars, where some would have them to be corrupted, as that of [R] *Shiloh,* Gen. xlix. 10. and others; as also to preserve them pure and entire to after ages, and to prevent the corrupting of them, either by the fraud of heretics, or negligence of the scribes; for no considerable mistakes could pass in all, and so many Translations, in all parts of the world, but they might easily be found and amended by others. Fourthly, they serve as so many glasses to declare the true sense and meaning of the Scripture, as it was understood in those times, when they were made; especially as they are exhibited in this work, where they may, at one view, be all compared together; for if the Commentaries of particular learned men deserve all due regard, much more those Translations (which also are often paraphrastical) which represent the sense of so many great and famous ancient Churches: especially those in the Eastern tongues, which, because of their nearness and affinity with the Original, are fittest to express the force and energy of divers words and phrases in Scripture; and, because of

their antiquity and general use, were of greatest authority among Jews or Christians. This is the sum of what is delivered concerning Translations in general there, or of any in particular elsewhere; with which how that agrees with which our Adversary charges the *Prolegomena* of correcting the Originals, yea of correcting the Word of God by them, may easily appear.

IV. Before we come to his reasons against Various Readings out of Translations, some things I shall premise, by which the reader may see both the untruths in the charge, and the invalidity of his reasons. 1. Though we grant, that Various Readings may be sometimes gathered out of Translations, yet we do not infer, nor doth it presently follow, that the present reading is corrupt or false, or must forthwith be corrected by the Translation. For though there were some difference in the Copies, yet it may be, the reading of our present Copies is the better, and therefore is not to be altered. Nay it is acknowledged and asserted in the *Prolegomena*, that the present reading being in possession of its authority ought not to be altered, though other Copies have formerly read otherwise, unless it can be evidently and clearly proved that some fault is crept into the present reading; and that we ought not to depart from the usual reading upon mere conjectures, unless evident necessity require, *Prol.* vii. sect. 23.

In omnibus ad Textum Originarium recurrendum est, nisi ubi planè constat errorem in Textum irrepsisse; ubi verò hoc probari non potest, necessariò ad Textum, ut ad normam, omnes Versiones probandæ sunt: nec satis est cum Bellarmino dicere, Ex fontibus, si puri sunt, corrigendæ sunt Versiones; hoc enim supponi debet fontes esse puros, donec contrarium liquidò probetur secundum regulam Jurisconsultorum: Quilibet præsumitur esse bonus, donec constet de contrario. Nec tamen ex quibusdam instantiis probatur generalis fontium corruptio, sed tantùm in his locis lapsum esse scribam, quod cum fontis puritate constare potest. So in sect. 22. *Primo lectionem Librarum Originalium, in vitio cubare clarè probandum est; tum error corrigendus; sic vera lectione restituta Textus Originarius Versionum regula et norma fit.* To the same purpose sect. 25. *Etsi Versiones, antiquæ præsertim, multum conferre possunt, cum erratum in Textum Originarium casu irrepsit ad veram lectionem indagandam, et restituendam; tamen generaliter loquendo Versiones omnes secundum Textus Originales corrigi, et examinari debent. Nam cum omnes Versiones tanquam rivuli ex Codicibus Originariis ut fontibus fluxerint, necesse est, ut quicquid veritatis in Versionibus inveniatur, illud à fontibus habuerint. Eatenus enim Versio*

vera dici potest quàtenus cum Textu Originario concordet. Sic enim Greg. de Valent. "Translatio vera est cujus sensus à suo fonte non deviat, sed sententias reddit easdem et æquales, nec ampliores, nec restrictiores," &c. *Contradictionem itaque planè implicat, affirmare simpliciter fontem ex Versione corrigendum; æquè enim absurdum est, ac si quis solis motum ex horologio corrigere vellet; vel cum automaton aberrat, dicere solem irregulariter circumferri potius quàm vitium in automato concedere.*

V. By all this it appears, that the *Prolegomena* do not equal the Translations with the Text, or make this one end of Translations, thereby to correct the Text; or as is most invidiously expressed, *to correct the Scripture! to correct the Word of God.* For though it be affirmed, that in some cases Various Readings may be gathered out of Translations, yet there is more to be considered before any change may be made of the present reading. For it must first be proved that the present reading contains something false and absurd, and cannot possibly stand; and then other things are to be considered, besides the bare reading of a Translation; the antecedents and consequents, the analogy of faith, collation of like places, the commentaries of ancient writers of the Church, comparing of other Copies, wherein also respect is to be had to the antiquity, mul-

titude, and goodness of the Copies in the care and exactness of the scribe; as appears by the rules given about Various Readings, Proleg. vi. sect. 6. among which this also is one, (which our Adversary takes notice of, and seems to carp at or to pervert,) which all sober men cannot but like, viz. *That it is not for every private man to alter any thing in the received reading, though he seem to have never so strong reasons; but the public authority of the Church, either express or implicit, is necessary.* "A recepta lectione non temerè recedendum, sed moderatè rationes et conjecturæ proponendæ sunt; et Ecclesiæ judicium expectandum," &c. which he translates thus, p. 207. "that in correcting the Originals we must take the consent of the guides of the Church;" how truly let any man judge by what we have said. The reason is given in the same *Prolegom.* vi. sect. 6. *That if this were permitted to every man, Pro norma fidei regulam Lesbiam haberemus, &c. Si enim in decretis Principum et Regum aliquid immutare læsæ Majestatis reum efficit, quantum erit crimen aliquid pro libitu mutare in Sacris hisce Scriptis in quibus, ut olim S. Augustinus, de cœlo Rex Regum, et Dominus Dominantium, loquitur!*

VI. Besides to correct an error crept into the Original is not properly to correct the Original, but to restore the Original to the true reading;

for no error is part of the Original Text, and therefore when the error can be demonstrated, the true reading is restored, not the Original Text corrected, or the Word of God corrected at man's pleasure, as is no less vainly than falsely objected in the *Considerations*. When the Bible is printed, and the compositors have made a proof, which is corrected by those that attend that work, can it be properly said, that they correct the Word of God, when they correct only the mistakes of the compositor? And so when the sheet is past the corrector's hand, and is printed off; if some by a more exact view shall still find some errors, which need further correction, may this be objected to him, that he presumes to correct the Word of God? Who would not think this to be ridiculous? Yet such is the reason of our Adversary. What is known and confessed to be the Word of God, it must be madness and impiety in any to go about to correct; but when an error by negligence of the transcriber or printer shall have crept in, and it shall be proved to be an error, must not this be amended or corrected, but presently we are guilty of correcting the Scripture or Word of God? To correct the Original by a Translation, is to alter what is the true reading of the Original by a Translation, that so it may agree with the Translation; for so our Author would have his reader understand it,

and an ordinary reader will make no other sense of his words; but is this the same with restoring the true and native reading, and to say, that not only other Copies, but even Translations, may conduce to this end?

VII. It is one thing to make use of a Translation about the true reading of a place, when any doubt arises; another thing, to make it equal with the Text. It may be made use of, when other Copies or pregnant and apparent reasons concur, but in this case it is not made equal with, but subservient to, the Text. To equal it with the Text, or to prefer it, is to correct the Text by it in all things wherein they differ; as some Romanists say of the *Vulgar Latin*, (I say some, for the learnedest among them deny it; and of those that affirm it, none ever yet attempted it.) But this had been senseless and absurd in our case, when there are diverse Translations, and those in some things differing from one another; for it is impossible to conform the Text to them all, and therefore could never be by us intended. Here is then no altar set up by God's altar, nor any preferring of man's care and wisdom, before the care and wisdom of God; but the preserving of God's altar, that it may not be thrust by, or any other set in its place; and the using of our care and diligence, with that reason which God hath given us, in a subserviency to his care and pro-

vidence. Nor is this to defame the Text, when we labour to preserve the purity of it, and to restore it to its original integrity, when it can appear the transcribers have failed; and so to transmit it to posterity. By this means we maintain the honour of the Text, and do what we can to prevent any mistakes for the future; wherein *whether more be not done in this Edition than hath been done hitherto by others,* I appeal to the judgment of all impartial and judicious readers.

VIII. We never said, that all differences of the Translation from the Original are to be reckoned for Various Readings; for it is frequently acknowledged that some variation may be by the mistake of the translator, or from paraphrastical expositions, where the sense and not the words are precisely expressed; where something, it may be, is added, to clear the sense, and some words left out, as not so necessary for the sense; and some errors may be from the transcribers of the Translations. *Proleg.* vi. sect. 11. *Proleg.* vii. sect. 23. *Proleg.* ix. sect. 12. 46. &c. But when no other probable cause can be given of the difference, save the variation of the Copy, and a plain reason may be given, why the translator so rendered it, as because of the ambiguity of words unpointed, or the change of letters alike in figure or sound, or transposition of

letters, and the like; in these cases, I see no reason why we may not conclude that the translator read in his Copy as he hath rendered, and thence collect a Various Reading from a Translation.

IX. We do not say, that these readings are of equal authority with those that are gathered out of Original Copies; nay, it is expressed, *Proleg.* vi. sect. 8. that they do not *pari certitudinis gradu incedere;* and therefore it must needs follow, that the present reading of the Original ought not to be altered upon the bare reading of a Translation, but that other pregnant reasons and arguments must concur, as we said before.

X. To these also we add, that these different readings out of Translations, are of the same nature with those gathered out of Original Copies; that is, they are only in lesser matters, not in things of any moment or concernment; they are such, whereby our faith and salvation are no way endangered; such as the Keri and Ketib, &c. Nor do we any where own that rule of Cappellus, That that reading, though by conjecture only, *ubi sensus melior fluit,* where the sense and coherence seem to be better, is always to be chosen; for many times we may conceive a sense, which would better agree with the words, in our apprehension, which yet the words of the

Text will not bear, and the sense which the present reading hath may be maintained, and is followed by more, and better, and ancienter Copies; and therefore I admit that rule no otherwise than reverend Usher, Epist. ad Cappellum, p. 22. "Ubi cætera reperiuntur paria ex Variantibus Lectionibus, ea præferenda quæ sensum parit commodiorem, atque antecedentibus et consequentibus cohærentem."

XI. These things premised, I say, that Various Readings may be gathered out of Translations, which may conduce to the true sense and reading, and may be taken into consideration when question shall arise about the reading of some place in the Original Texts. This is proved at large, *Proleg.* vi. sect. 9, 10. both by consent of the best divines, and men of greatest skill in the Hebrew, and greatest patrons of the integrity of the Hebrew Text, and by [S] apparent reason; of all which our Adversary takes no notice, but prudently passes over in silence (as in other places) what he could not answer. It is shewed out of Jerom, Beza, Casaubon, Drusius, Schindler, De Dieu, Bochartus, Hottinger, Salmasius, besides Brentius, Osiander, Calvin, Musculus, Mercer, &c. how common it is among Commentators and others, to gather sometimes out of Translations, how they read in their Copies differing from the present reading. Nor do I re-

member any author of note that generally denied the same, before the late quarrels of Bootius and Buxtorf against Cappellus; who yet, whilst they grant conjectural Various Readings out of Translations (see Bootius's Vindic. 22. p. 225.) do in effect say as much as their Adversary: only our Author, without any distinction or limitation, absolutely denies all, of whatever kind or degree soever they be; which, for my part, I know not any before him to have done. Nay, he tells us, p. 333. "That it is impossible to know how any translator read in his Copy, when he differs from the common reading." He might have done well to have given answer to those many instances and reasons to the contrary, mentioned, *Prolegom.* vi. and to the testimony of those great divines and linguists, whom he passeth by, as not worthy his notice. Were all these, and many others, no better than learned mountebanks, as he is pleased to call all of this opinion? p. 315. Surely some of them at least might have deserved better language from him.

XII. The reverend Usher, though he would exclude the LXX. (how justly we have [T]shewed, *Prolegom.* ix.) yet grants that, out of other interpreters, Various Readings may be gathered. Epist. ad Cappell. p. 22. he saith, "Ex quibusdam veterum interpretationibus excerpi aliquas posse variantes Hebraici textus lectiones:" and

p. 4. "Cujusmodi παραράματα ob characterum aut sonorum in vocabulis præcipuè Hebraicis similitudinem, aut levem aliquam à minus attento inspectore conceptam literarum transpositionem, multò etiam facilius possunt obrepere;" after which he adds, "Et ut in multis hujus generis locis, Hebraicum quo interpres usus est exemplar eandem, quam ille reddidit, lectionem exhibuerit; de eorum tamen *pluribus*," (he saith not, *de omnibus*,) "nullo nobis constare potest modo, utrum ipsi interpreti an codici quem præ manibus ille habuit, Hebraico ista accepta referenda fuerit differentia: præsertim si interpres ille ex Judaizantium fuerit numero." In the next page he saith the same of Bootius, (though Bootius labours, Vindic. c. 23. to wrest the Primate's words,) "Ex ea tantum versione, quæ LXX. nomen præfert, colligendas eas esse negat, *(Bootius,)* ex reliquis omnibus interpretibus desumi eas posse libenter concedit." We see what the opinion of this learned Prelate was, and that he saith as much as the *Prolegomena;* and yet it is well known how great a defender he was of the purity of the Original Texts.

XIII. But though he, and all others that say the same with him, must pass with our Author among learned mountebanks, and not be thought worthy any answer; yet, with his good leave, I will mind him of some of those places instanced

in the *Prolegomena,* and appeal to his conscience whether he thinks the translators did not read in their Copies as they have expressed in their Translation, Gen. xlvii. ver. ult. these words, על ראש המטה are rendered by the LXX. ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, *in summitatem virgæ suæ,* and so the words are alleged, Heb. xi. 21. and so rendered by the Syriac, the difference arising only from the various pointing of המטה, which may be rendered either *super lectum,* or *super virgam; lectum,* if we read it מִטָּה *mitta,* but *virgam,* if we read it מַטֶּה *matte.* Now, when the LXX. and the Syriac render *virgam,* and not *lectum,* whether may we not conclude that they read *matte* and not *mitta,* the difference being so small, and no colourable reason to be given or devised otherwise, why they should render it *virgam,* and not *lectum?* Hence there is scarce any expositor but observes this Various Reading out of this Translation. So Isa. ix. 1. it is observed by Casaubon, Exerc. 13. n. 21. ad annum 31. n. 32. that the LXX. by the change of a point, read הקל *hakel* for *hekal,* because they render it, ταχὺ ποίει, *citò fac;* whereas, according to the present punctuation, it signifies ἐκουφίσθη, *sublevata est.* Who will not conclude with this learned man, that they read *hakel,* rather than *hekal,* when their Translation agrees with *hakel,* and not with *hekal,* and

the difference is only in a point? So Exod. xxi. 8. The words, אשר לא יעדה are rendered by the LXX. and Jerom, *Quæ sibi desponsata fuit*, which, according to the modern reading, should be, *Quæ non desponsavit eam.* Who will not hence gather, that the LXX. and Jerom read לו in their Copy, which signifies *sibi*, and not לא *non*, as it is now, seeing לו and לא are in sound and pronunciation the same? And that they did, *de facto*, read so, appears by the Masora, which puts the different reading, לו in the margin under ק"ר and לא in the Text. The like may be observed in Jerom, and the LXX. in Jos. xv. 47. Isa. xlix. 5. where the Masora also observes both readings: but suppose the Masora had not observed the differences, had it not been true, that the Copies had differed? And could not this variety have been gathered from Jerom and the LXX. without the Masora? Much more is brought to this purpose in the same place, all which the Adversary passeth by. To all which may be further added, Judg. viii. 16. וַיֵּדַע בָּהֶם *and with them he taught the men of Succoth.* It is clear that the ancient reading was, וַיָּדָשׁ בָּהֶם *and with them he tare,* or *threshed,* &c. as he had threatened them, ver. 7. וְדַשְׁתִּי *then I will tear,* or *thresh,* LXX. κατέξανεν, as v. 7. καταξανῶ. Al. ἠλόησεν, as v. 7. ἀλοήσω. Lat *contrivit,* as v. 7.

conteram; see also the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic. Jos. ix. 4. וַיַּצְמִּרוּ *and made as if they had been ambassadors,* r. וַיִּצְטַיְּדוּ *and they took victuals,* or *provision, for their journey:* LXX. ἐπισιτίσαντο, ἢ ἡτοιμάσαντο. Lat. *tulerunt sibi cibaria,* so the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic; so v. 12. הִצְטַיְּדוּ and v. 11. קחו צידה. 2 Kings xx. 13. וַיִּשְׂמַע r. וַיִּשְׂמַח LXX. ἢ ἐχάρη, Lat. *et lætatus est:* so the Syriac and Arabic; so our Bishops' Bible, *(and was glad of him;)* so Isa. xxxix. 2. both in the Hebrew, and all Translations. Jerem. xv. 14. וְהַעֲבַרְתִּי *and I will make thee to pass,* r. וְהַעֲבַדְתִּי *and I will make thee to serve,* LXX. καταδουλώσω σε. So the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic; so Jer. xvii. 4. both in the Hebrew, and all Translations; Jerem. xxxi. 32. בָּעַלְתִּי בָם *I was a husband to them,* r. בָּעַלְתִּי בָם *I regarded them not;* LXX. ἠμέλησα: So the Syriac and Arabic; so the Apostle, Heb. viii. 9. Now, let me appeal to any unbiassed man, yea to our Adversary himself, whether in these places they do not think in their consciences, that the LXX. and the other Translators read in their Copies as we have shewed, and if they did, whether it be not evident, that in some cases, Various Readings may be gathered out of Translations?

XIV. What he further writes in his way of declaiming, I shall not need to trouble myself

about, seeing nothing is by him brought that infringes our assertion in the least, the controversy being rightly stated. Only one thing I cannot pass by, wherein I cannot but admire his extreme confidence in urging a thing so palpably untrue, and so oft by himself contradicted: "Let them prove," saith he, "that there was ever in the world any other Copy of the Bible differing in any one word, from those that we now enjoy; let them produce one testimony, one author of credit or reputation, that can, or doth, or ever did, speak one word to this purpose; let them direct us to any relick, nay monument, any kind of remembrance of them, and not put us off with weak conjectures, upon the signification of one or two words, and it shall be of weight with us," p. 317. "The care of God over his truth, and the fidelity of the Jewish Church will not permit us to enter into the least suspicion that ever there was in the world any Copy of the Bible, differing in the least from those we enjoy—the authors of this insinuation cannot produce the least testimony to make it good," p. 319. This is a strange assertion; such as I think never any man maintained before; *not any Copy that ever was, to differ in one word, nay not in the least, which extends to syllables, letters, and points*; that no testimony no relick, no author of credit, no monument of antiquity, not the least testimony can be brought,

&c.! Do not all the Various Readings both of the Old and New Testament proclaim the apparent untruth of this? And doth not himself frequently confess, that there are varieties amongst Copies? p. 173. "That in some Copies, and those of good antiquity, there are Divers Readings;" p. 190. "that the Keri and Ketib are Various Readings;" p. 296. "that the transcribers have had failings, and that Various Readings have thence risen," p. 165. So p. 191, 347. &c. What thinks he of those places in the New Testament, especially [U] that in 1 John v. 8. where a verse is left out in many ancient Copiés, and appears so to have been by the Fathers that wrote against Arius? Is there no author of credit, no monument of antiquity, that testifies that some ancient Copies wanted these words, which yet all our modern Copies have? Are not the whole collections of Diverse Readings in Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, Camerarius, and others, a real confutation of this? He hath looked through the *Prolegomena*, as he saith, especially *Proleg.* vii. which he so much opposes; he quotes sect. 12. And could he not there find many instances and testimonies of credit to disprove this general assertion? He could not but read there the testimony of Kimchi, Præf. Com. in Proph. Priores: "Viri Synagogæ magnæ, qui Legem nobis in pristinum statum restituerunt, invenerunt differentias in libris, et secuti

sunt multitudinem;" of Ben Chajim, in the Venice and Basil Bibles, who notes the difference of some Copies, besides the Keri and Ketib, which he notes not with a ק but with א"נ that is *another copy*. But most evidently is this shewed in Jos. xxi. 36, 37. where two verses were left out in the second Venice Edition and in Jonathan's Paraphrase, and in the margin the Masoretical note is, "that in no ancient and corrected Copies these verses are to be found, nor in the famous copy of R. Hillel; yet in some later Copies they are found;" whereupon learned Buxtorf, in his Vindic. part 1. c. 4. p. 105, 106, &c. sticks not to affirm and maintain that they ought not to be put in, and that the ancient Copies are genuine: yea the number אתּ collected by the Masorites in this chapter agrees, if those two be left out; and yet they are now generally printed in our Copies, and the context shews that they ought to be there. In the same section is added, that Junius besides the Keri and Ketib notes a difference of diverse words, differing in sense also, out of an ancient MS. Hebrew Copy at Heidelberg, in 2 Chron. xxvi. 5. and xxxv. 3. which he prefers before the modern reading.

XV. The like is shewed in the next section out of many places in St. Jerom, an author of good credit in these things. Epist. ad Suriam et Fretel. upon these words, Psal. xxxv. 10. "Om-

nia ossa mea dicunt, Domine," he saith, "se deprehendisse in Editione, LXX. *bis Domine*;" and after adds: "Multa sunt Exemplaria apud Hebræos, *quæ ne semel quidem Dominum habent.*" But in our modern Copies it is once. In the same Epistle upon those words of Psal. cxxx. 4. "Propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine," he saith, "Aquilam legisse, תּוֹדָא et vertisse φόβον, *timorem*, Theodotionem verò et Symmachum legisse, תּוֹרָה, et vertisse νόμον, legem;" where he not only grants the Hebrew Copies to have varied, but also gathers a Various Reading out of the Translation of Aq. Theod. and Symm. yet neither reading is in our present Copies, which read תִּוָּרֵא *timeberis*. The same on Hos. v. 13. write, "Alii malè legunt, יערים per ם literam quæ transfertur in *sylvas*, pro יריב Jareb," which agrees with our Copies: so on Hab. ii. 19. "Sciendum in quibusdam Hebraicis voluminibus, non esse additum *omnis* sed absolutè *spiritum* legi." Here we see the word כל *omnis* was wanting in some Hebrew Copies in Jerom's time. Much more might be brought of Jerom and others to this purpose. These places, except only the last, our Adversary had read in the *Prolegomena*, and yet affirms, there never was any Copy in the world differed in the least from our present Copies, and that no testimony nor author of credit, nor any relick of antiquity could be brought to the con-

trary. Was he in a dream, or were his wits a wool-gathering when he wrote this? Or, having read these things in the *Prolegomena*, to which no answer could be given, did he write the contrary to delude the ignorant reader? I do not know how to excuse him. He tells us elsewhere, Ep. p. 17. we must grant (concerning Various Readings in the New Testament) what ocular inspection evinces to be true. But now it seems we must be hoodwinked, and not believe what we see with our eyes; and though nothing be more clear, than that there were of old, and still are, differences in the Hebrew and Greek copies, yet we must believe there never was any Copy different from our present Copies, not in the least!

XVI. We have done with this which was the main charge. The next thing is about the Keri and Ketib, that is, certain marginal notes in the Hebrew Bibles, where the Keri is the word that must be read, placed in the margin, with a ק״ the Ketib, or word written in the text, marked with a little circle or cipher, to which the points belonging to the marginal word are put, to intimate, that this word, though written in the Text, ought not to be read, but that in the margin; concerning which I have [W]spoken at large, *Proleg.* viii. sect. 18, 19, &c. ad 27. where is shewed what they are, sect. 18. to what heads they may

be reduced, sect. 9, 20. that the number is not the same, but much differing, by two or three hundred in the chief editions of the Bible, sect. 21. that the authors of them were not the sacred penmen, nor Esdras and his fellows, sect. 22, 23. that the most of them were collected by the post-talmudical rabbins, out of several ancient Copies; and that they left the common reading in the Text; and put the other, which they judged the better, in the margin; and that some of them were gathered before the Talmud, sect. 24. that they were not critical conjectures of the rabbins, but Various Readings, and some few of another nature, sect. 25. After which are added some observations about them, sect. 26. I shall not go over the same things again, but refer the reader to the *Prolegomena.* Nor do I know to what purpose our Author goes over them here. I shall only touch upon what is untruly by him charged on the *Prolegomena.*

XVII. Page 206. He reckons this among the paradoxes in the *Prolegomena,* that the Keri and Ketib are critical notes, consisting partly of the Various Readings of the Masorites, and late rabbins; and p. 157 he sets it down thus: "That the קרי וכתיב, of which sort are above 800 in the Hebrew Bibles, are Various Lections, partly gathered by some Judaical rabbins out of ancient Copies, partly their critical amendments: for

which he cites in the margin, *Proleg.* 8. sect. 23, &c. Answer: In both there is nothing truly related; but untruth and nonsense jumbled together. For first he saith, "They are critical notes consisting partly of Various Lections," which is a kind of contradiction: for if they be *critical notes* they cannot be either in part or in whole *Various Lections*. *Critical notes* are such wherein men give their own judgment upon some reading, whether it be true or false, or which reading they like best: *Various Readings* are the differences of Copies collected and offered to the reader's judgment. In the other place he makes them all to be Various Readings, but partly collected by some rabbins out of ancient copies, and partly their critical amendments; that is, some of them are gathered out of Copies, others are gathered without authority of Copies, grounded only upon their critical faculty in conjecturing. This may be his meaning, or else I cannot make any good sense of his words. Howsoever he explain himself, the charge is no less void of truth than of sense, as the place by him cited will plainly shew to any that will look into it, (for still he never quotes the words,) where it will appear that *there is not one word of critical conjectures, or that any part of the Keri and Ketib are such conjectures; nor is there any mention at all of conjectures, save that the Author shews his dislike of them.*

XVIII. That which is affirmed of them in these sections is, 1. that Esdras and his fellows were not the authors of these notes, but that they were gathered long after his time, partly before and partly after the Talmud; that they could not come from Esdras or the Prophets of his times, because these Various Readings (for so they are generally acknowledged, as by most divines, so by our Adversary himself,) are found in the writings of Esdras, and the latter Prophets, as well as in the rest; and it were very absurd to think that they gathered Various Readings out of several Copies of the books they had written, and to place one reading in the margin, and the other in the Text, as if they knew not which were the true reading of their own Books; and that any of the rest should be gathered either by them or any other of the holy penmen is no less absurd, both for the same reason, as also because they would have restored the true reading, (if they had found any difference in Copies,) which they, being infallibly guided, might have done, and not have left it doubtful which reading was to be followed, or what was the true sense of the Holy Ghost, by noting both the readings, and so leaving all in suspense. This is altogether unbefitting the holy penmen of Scripture: and our Adversary, though he be loth to yield to the truth, yet confesses he is not able to satisfy himself in the original and

spring of this variety. 2. It is proved, sect. *24.* that some of these were observed by the talmudical rabbins, being mentioned in the Talmud, as those "de vocibus scriptis et non lectis, et de lectis et non scriptis," and those which they call *obscene*, for which these *chaste rabbins*, who would be wiser than God and more pure than the Holy Ghost, put others which they judged more modest in the margin to be read in the Synagogues, according to that in the Talmud, Megil. c. 3. "Omnes voces quæ in Lege sunt obscœnæ eas legant honestè;" that all the rest (of which there is not a word in the Talmud) were collected by the Masorites after the Talmud. 3. That question is handled, whether, supposing the Masorites to be the authors, they gathered them out of various Copies, or made them out of their own judgments and critical conjectures: where it is concluded, that excepting those which they counted *obscene*, of which number are ten, which could not proceed from the difference of Copies, but from the boldness and superstition of the rabbins, and excepting נְעָרָ and יְרוּשָׁלַם (which have a peculiar consideration) that all the rest came from variety of Copies, where they noted the one reading in the margin, not daring to change the reading of the Text out of reverence to the antiquity of their Copies, but left it as it was, only they joined the points of the marginal word to that

in the Text, to shew that the word of the margin was to be read, which they judged the better reading.

XIX. This is the common opinion and judgment of the learned in these matters, such as Mercer, Drusius, Bertram, Erpenius, Pagett, Piscator, Sixtin Amama, &c. and of Buxtorf himself. And after all, are related the arguments of Cappellus, who labours to prove, that the Masorites gathered them not out of private Copies, but by their own critical conjectures; whose opinion is disliked, and his arguments answered. By all this it appears most clearly, that our Adversary abuses both his reader, and the author of the *Prolegomena*, with palpable untruths, ascribing that to the author of the *Prolegomena*, which he is so far from holding, that he maintains the clean contrary. For he proves, that *the Keri and Ketib are not critical amendments of the rabbins, but Various Readings of ancient Copies, (except those before excepted, which he is so far from making critical amendments of the Texts, that he taxes the rabbins for their boldness and superstition therein:)* yea, the Adversary himself, though he thus writes, yet in expressive terms elsewhere, (forgetting what he had formerly said,) acquits the author of the *Prolegomena* from this calumny, p. 305. "That they are all, or most of them, (Keri and Ketib,) critical amendments of the rabbins is

not allowed, (in the *Prolegomena,*) for which latter part of his determination we thank the learned author;" and p. 307. "In the mean time, I cannot but rejoice, that Cappellus's fancy, than which I know nothing more prejudicial to the truth of God, is not allowed." Thus we see, we are still accused and acquitted by the same pen, as I have already said.

XX. After these, he tells us, that the arguments brought against the divine original of the notes are capable of an easy solution, which he is not at leisure as yet to shew, although he had told us before that he could not satisfy himself about the original of this variety. In the mean time, let him enjoy his own opinion, and let me enjoy mine: and if he can bring better proofs for the divine original than I have brought against it, I shall acknowledge my error; if not, I expect he will retract his, and some other things he hath about the Keri and Ketib; which I shall have occasion to answer in another place, and therefore I pass them by here.

XXI. Before I conclude this chapter, something must be added concerning the notes extracted out of Grotius, which the Adversary saith, "are brought as an instance of collecting Various Readings upon conjectures," or rather of "corrections of the Original, when any gross corruptions have befallen them," p. 159, 206, 315.

Now, though I might well pass over what is here charged, it being no where acknowledged in the *Prolegomena*, that the Original Texts are corrupted, but the contrary maintained; nor that upon mere conjectures Various Readings are to be gathered, (as we have already shewed,) and therefore, that these notes out of Grotius could not possibly be brought for any such end: yet, because it is the opinion of some learned men, that these collections out of Grotius are one main cause of all this stir against the *Biblia Polyglotta*, I shall briefly consider what he objects upon this account. This we find chiefly, p. 313 and 348. In the first place he saith, "That to make this evident by instances, we have a great number of such Various Lections gathered by Grotius in the *Appendix*. He wondered at first view, how the volume should come under that name. The greatest part give no Various Lections of the Hebrew Text, as is pretended, but various interpretations of others from the Hebrew. But the *Prolegomena* salves this seeming difficulty. They are not Various Lections collected out of any Copies extant, or ever known to have been extant, but critical conjectures of his own for the amendment of the Text, or at most conjectures upon the readings of the words by Translators, especially the LXX. and Vulgar Latin." In the other place, he saith, "he shall not much concern himself therein, they

are nothing less than Various Readings of that learned man's own observation, setting aside, first the Various Lections of the LXX, the Vulgar Latin, Symmachus, and Theodotion, wherein we are not concerned. Secondly, the Keri and Ketib, which we have oftentimes, over and over in this Volume: Thirdly, The Various Readings of the Greek and Occidental Jews, which we have also elsewhere: Fourthly, conjectures how the LXX, or Vulgar Latin read by altering of letters only: Fifthly, conjectures of his own how the Text may be mended; and a very little room will take up what remains. By the cursory view he hath taken of them, he sees not one word that can pretend to be a Various Lection, unless it belong to the Keri and Ketib, or the difference between the Oriental and Occidental Jews."

XXII. Answer: I am not ignorant with what an envious eye [X] that incomparably learned man, the miracle of our times, is looked upon by all our Novellists; and that his earnest study of the peace of the Church, and endeavour to close up, rather than to make wider the breaches and wounds of Christendom, hath exposed him to the malice and fury of the turbulent and fiery spirits of all sides. I shall not need to apologize for him; what height of learning and depth of judgment dwelt in him, his works proclaim to all learned and moderate men, and will speak to all posterity;

others have, with more able pens, vindicated him from those obloquies and aspersions, which unreasonable men have cast upon him. A man he was of that eminency in all kinds of learning, divine and human, of that exact judgment, prudence, piety, and moderation, that I believe he hath left but few equals in the Christian world: In his younger years he was by Scaliger himself (whose over-weening conceit of his own great abilities would hardly permit him to speak well of any) styled ὁ θαυμάσιος, in his Epistles: I could not therefore but think that an extract out of his learned Annotations might be fit amongst others to be inserted in this work, and the rather because he was one that did not *extrema sectari*, but, without inclining to any party or faction, did propose to himself the search of the naked truth for itself, and therefore I might hope that this pains would be thankfully received by learned, wise, and moderate men, wherein I know I have not failed of my ends. As for those violent and heady spirits, *turba gravis paci*, &c. I know it is in vain to think of satisfying them, or to hope that any thing will relish with them, save what is fitted to their own distempered palate: for as Espenc. in Tit. 1. "Quibus os putet, omnia putida sunt, non alimenti, sed oris vitio."

XXIII. I shall not need therefore to apologize, either for him or for myself, in publishing this

Extract, but shall observe, that our Author will proceed in his usual way of calumnies. For first, he cannot make it appear by any one word in the *Prolegomena* or *Appendix*, that this was the end of publishing his notes, as an instance of gathering Various Readings by conjectures, when the Text is corrupt, but merely because of his great and general learning, which might make them acceptable to learned and moderate men; for which cause, I conceived, they might justly deserve a place amongst the collections of other learned men of the like nature which are here exhibited. Nor secondly, do these notes consist only or chiefly upon such conjectures; there are scarce one or two in the whole Pentateuch; nor doth he go merely upon conjectures, but usually upon some ancient Translations, or testimony of ancient writers, and reasons drawn from the circumstances of the Text: and so for other books of the Old Testament, the most of them are critical notes about the several Translations of others, and about the literal sense and reading of the Text; scarce one or two of the Keries are mentioned in three or four books, as we shall shew anon; and therefore *not served over and over*; yea, our Author himself, p. 348. contradicting what he had said, p. 313. and elsewhere, after his usual manner, saith, "they are nothing less than Various Readings of that learned man's

own observation," and therefore *not such conjectural Various Readings, as he saith, are brought for instances in the Appendix.* Thirdly, that those out of the New Testament, which are far the greater part of that Extract, are Various Readings out of several Copies, (not bare conjectures,) with his judgment upon them, and the reasons for it; and therefore our Author may cease wondering how these few sheets, (which are nothing less than a volume, as he calls them,) should come under the name of Various Readings, seeing the greatest part, which may give denomination to the whole, consists of Various Readings of the New Testament: and though there be other observations amongst them of great use and worth, yet the greater part consisting of Diverse Readings, might well give the name to the whole. Besides, it is not said in the Title, that they be all Various Readings of the Hebrew, but Various Readings in general; and though there be few of the Hebrew in the Old Testament, yet there are others of the Greek, Septuagint, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Aquila; the Vulgar Latin, and other Translations; besides those of the New Testament; and therefore the *Prolegomena* needs no such way, as is by him furnished, to salve a difficulty which is not. Fourthly, the publisher did never take upon him to defend whatsoever is said by any in their notes which are added to the Bible; he is not bound to

maintain all that Nobilius, Lucas Brugensis, Mr. Young, or any others have said in any of their observations, but thinks it enough that in general they are of great use, and acceptable to learned men, who know how to make use of them; and that to satisfy the desires of such, he had just cause to annex them to *This Edition*: but if any man shall meet with some things, which he cannot relish, let him not reject the gold, because of some dross, or the wheat, though there be some chaff. The publisher professes, there are some things which he cannot wholly subscribe to, yet he is far from rejecting the whole, or thinking it therefore not fit to be published: he proposes them to all: let every man judge as he thinks fit, and abound in his own sense: whether they approve, or reject, more or fewer, it shall be no offence to him.

CHAPTER VII.

I. *Divers Charges upon these Various Readings here exhibited in particular.* II. *The great bulk of them, that they are served twice or thrice over. This calumny answered. All those of the Original Texts may be comprised in two or three sheets.* III. *Neither all differences whatsoever, nor those out of all books printed or written, here collected. The vast untruth of this charge shewed for the Hebrew.* IV. *And the Greek.* V. *The comparing of many Copies useful.* VI. *Practised by others, and commended by Origen, Jerom, Erasmus, Beza, Camerarius, Nobilius, Stephanus, &c.* VII. *The great use of collecting Various Readings out of several Copies.* VIII. *To prevent future mistakes.* IX. *Practised by the Jews.* X. *Approved by Buxtorf.* XI. *His Critica Sacra now printing at Basil; the title-page sent over.* XII. *The difference of the Keri and Ketib, in sundry Editions, not by mistake of the printer.* XIII. *The difference of divers printed Copies shewed in some instances.* XIV. *The great use of the two Catalogues of the Keri and Ketib, not twice mentioned to increase the bulk.* XV. *That the Copies are, some of them, the ancientest in the world: They are all sufficiently attested.* XVI. *Of Beza's Copy.* XVII. *The MS. of Emmanuel College in Cambridge. The Adversary's mistakes: that Morinus is an aspiring Jesuit: that Ben Chajim corrected the impression of Felix Pratensis, &c.* XVIII. *That divers differences of Copies are omitted: the publisher not bound to give a judgment of those exhibited.* XIX. *In this Edition, together with*

the chiefest Translations, are exhibited the most and ancientest Copies: The MSS. accounted great treasures in private Libraries, now put into every man's hand.

I. BESIDES these generals, there are divers things which he finds fault with, in these particular readings here exhibited in the last Volume, which we must consider, before we pass from this head of Various Readings. He is offended with their multitude and great bulk, questions the antiquity and goodness of the Copies, and the fidelity of the collectors; is angry that they are barely propounded, and no choice made, nor judgment given on them: of all which in order. First, for the bulk, he saith, he was "startled at this bulky collection," p. 146, p. 188. "What a bulk or heap they are now swelled to, we see in the *Appendix*;" so p. 206, and 349. "a spurious brood that hath spawned itself over the face of so much paper," as p. 192. yea, "whatever varying word, syllable, or tittle, could be brought to hand, wherein any books, though but of yesterday, vary from the common received Copies, though manifestly a mistake, superfluous, or deficient, inconsistent with the sense of the place, yea barbarous, is presently imposed upon us as a Various Reading," *ibid.* So p. 194. "All differences whatsoever, that could be found in any Copies, printed or otherwise, are equally given

out; yea, p. 194. "It is manifest that the design of this *Appendix* was, to gather every thing of this sort that might by any means be afforded; and however Satan seems to have exerted the utmost of his malice, men of former ages the utmost of their negligence, of these later ages of their diligence, the result of all is in this collection of the *Appendix*," &c. Nay, "to increase the bulk, divers of the same readings are twice, and oftener, mustered over. The Keri and Ketib are twice served over, to increase the bulk, and present a face of new variety to the less attentive reader," p. 158. and 304, 305. yea, "a third time in Grotius," p. 348, 349. "over and over;" and "so those of the New Testament are given over again by Grotius and Lucas Brugensis. The collection of them makes a book bigger than the New Testament itself," p. 189, &c.

II. For Answer: First our Adversary, by these many reiterated expressions, would intimate, as if all the *last Volume*, or *Appendix*, consisted of nothing but Various Readings of the Original Texts, when as the whole Volume consists of above two hundred sheets, of which there are not above two sheets of the Hebrew Various Readings, viz. only the Keri and Ketib, with those of Ben-Ascher, and Ben Naphtali, the Oriental and Occidental Jews, (which are in divers other Editions of the Hebrew Bibles,) reckon-

ing in also the Annotations about the Keri and Ketib; yea, the bare readings themselves might be reduced into almost one sheet: and as for those of the New Testament, gathered out of above forty old Greek MSS. they are all contained in nine sheets, of which the very names of so many MSS. so often repeated upon necessity of every difference, with the present reading of the Text, and the noting down the chapter and verse at every Various Reading, takes up the most of those sheets; so that I durst undertake, that all these differences noted out of those MSS. if they were printed by themselves, (without any thing else added,) might be reduced into one or two sheets: so that here this great voluminous bulk is shrunk, from two hundred sheets, to two or three. The greatest part of that Volume is spent about the Greek Septuagint; wherein are those large notes of Nobilius, that rich magazine and treasury of learning, so accounted by all learned men; Master Patrick Young's notes upon Tecla's Septuagint; the collation of the Venice and Complutense Edition of the Sept. with the Roman: whereby the reader hath, in a manner, all the several Editions of the Sept. here presented in one Volume, and may consult them all at pleasure, with divers other old MSS. divers notes upon the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Samaritan, Persian, Ethiopic, and Vulgar Latin; of all

which, with the Tables of the proper names expounded, and an Index of all the Scripture, is that Volume, in a manner, made up; which things, before they were printed (the heads of them being published and sent abroad) were much applauded by all, never disliked, that I could hear of, till now, by any.

III. That all differences whatsoever are here collected out of all books, printed or written, every varying word, tittle, or syllable, that could be brought to hand, is far from truth, as appears by the readings themselves, and the Copies out of which they were gathered, which our Author could not be so blind as not to read, though he was in such haste that he could not consider how *the calumny did confute itself, and might be found out by every one that looks upon the names of the Copies:* For first, there is not one Hebrew Copy, either MS. or printed, here collated, or any differences collected, save those of the Keri and Ketib, Ben Ascher, and Ben Naphtali, the Eastern and Western Jews, which our Author himself tells us are in most Editions of the Hebrew Bibles; only here they are more perfectly enumerated than in any former Edition, being gathered out of divers chief Editions of the Bible compared together, amongst which there is a difference of two or three hundred in some Editions, which confutes the opinion of Arias

Montanus, and some others, (of whom our Author seems to be one,) that would have the Keri and Ketib to be the same in all Copies whatsoever; which labour might deserve, as it hath found amongst learned and ingenious men, thanks and acceptation, rather than reproach and contumelies. Other varieties in the Hebrew Copies are not collected, (though divers might have been, as we shall see anon;) nor did we want Hebrew MSS. of good antiquity, one belonging sometime to Leo Modena, written above three hundred years ago; another more ancient, belonging to [Y] Caius College in Cambridge, part of which was collated; of which, because it seemed to be negligently written and for other reasons, I did not think fit to mention the differences. So here we see how far from truth this charge is concerning the Hebrew.

IV. And as far as it is from truth concerning the Greek Text of the New Testament: for (as any may see) here was not one printed Copy collated, (though there be many differences between the Editions of Erasmus, Beza, the Complutense, &c. and others, as all know who have collated any,) and divers MS. Copies we had which were not collated at all, but chose out those that are exhibited, leaving out the rest. Those Various Readings observed out of the Complutense, are indeed, most of them, noted

among the rest, but not by comparing any printed Copy, but as they are in Stephens's Various Readings, gathered out of his sixteen Copies; so that we see how far our Author hath exceeded for the number.

V. But suppose that more Copies MS. and printed had been collated and exhibited, was it ever accounted a crime before now? If to consult and compare ancient Copies had been heretofore always accounted good service for preserving the original Text, or confirming and restoring the true reading, is their diligence to be [Z] condemned that have done more than others before them in that kind? If it were commendable in some, it cannot justly be blamed in others. Those that have heretofore laboured about any special Editions of the Old or New Testaments, used to consult with all the ancient Copies they could get, or others of good note. Thus did Origen in his Hexapla; thus did St. Jerom, as appears frequently in his works; so did the Complutense divines, Montanus, Erasmus, Beza, Nobilius, Heintenius, Lucas Brugensis, the Louvain divines, and others; thus among the Jews did Ben Ascher, Ben Naphtali, R. Hillel, R. Ben Chajim, R. Menachem, Ben Louzano, R. Manasseh Ben Israel, &c. they compared divers Copies, noted the differences, and sometimes gave their judgment, pitching upon that reading

which they judged to be best. Where is our crime, who do the same now? nay, not so much, seeing we do not presume to alter any thing in the received or common reading, but only propound what we find, and leave it to others to judge as they shall see cause.

VI. Our Author commends Erasmus, Beza, Camerarius, Stephanus, and others, for the same thing for which we are reproved. It seems, if this had been done by others, all had been well. Rob. Stephanus in his Edition of the Vulgar Latin, in 1540, names many old Copies he had collated, whose Different Readings he put in the margin; and in his accurate Edition of the New Testament, he reckons sixteen Greek Copies, which he collated, and out of them noted 2384 Various Readings, which he thought fit to put in the margin of his Edition; nor was he ever blamed by any, but highly approved by all for his pains and diligence. Lucas Brugensis, a man of great learning and judgment, and a great defender of the Original Copies and one who spent most of his time in collating old Copies of the Hebrew, Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and Latin, in that excellent book, his *Notationes in loca variantia S. Scripturæ*, reckons up above 100 Copies which he compared and used. Heintenius and the Louvain divines, as appears by their notes, used all the Copies printed and MSS.

which they could get, that they might help forward a correct and perfect Edition of the Vulgar Latin. Erasmus, in his Preface to his excellent *Annotations on the New Testament*, tells us what Copies he compared, and what pains he took about the several readings, that no error might pass, but the genuine reading might be established. But now it seems the case is altered; the more Copies we use, the more labour is spent to no purpose. We are told that in gathering these Various Readings, we have the utmost of "Satan's malice, the negligence of former times, and the diligence of later times, needlessly, yea, to eminent scandal heaped up together: for the result of them all is in this Appendix!"

VII. But could this Aristarchus see nothing useful in the variety of Copies? Saint Augustine was of another mind, when he wrote thus of the variety of Translations in his time. "Tantum abest ut ea varietate offendi, turbari, et incertus reddi debeat pius et Christianus lector, ut ex earum collatione et examine certior reddatur, quid potissimum sequendum sit, quàm si unica duntaxat versio esset?" and why may we not say the same of the Various Readings of the Original? Methinks it shews a special providence over these Books, that notwithstanding some variety in smaller matters, all do constantly [A] agree

in all matters of weight, whether of faith or life, yea, historical and prophetical; for it will be hard for him, or any other, to find in all this bulky collection any one place which intrenches upon any point of faith or religion, or any other matter of moment; which must needs shew God's wonderful care in preserving this rule of our faith and life entire without any danger; and even in those lesser things he hath not left us without means to judge of the best reading, when any casual error shall appear. Besides, seeing no one Copy now extant can pretend to be a standard in every thing for all others, and our Adversary flies to this, (as we shewed already,) that all the revealed truth is preserved entire in some Copy or other; and seeing it is impossible to consult all Copies in the world; therefore to have as many as we can, and those of greatest antiquity, and of the best note, to consult with, is the best means that can be used to judge of the true reading, and to preserve it to posterity. Now in these Various Readings we have all the best and choicest Copies that could be got, which are tendered to every man's view; and therefore this collection must needs be of great use. Those therefore, that have used their utmost diligence in this kind for preserving the truth, are but ill requited for their pains, when their diligence in preserving it is compared to Satan's malice in corrupting it.

VIII. Let me add, that the observing of the varieties is a good means to preserve the true reading against future mistakes, when we have so many Copies at hand to consult with upon all occasions, and among them so many conspiring in the same reading in all matters of any moment; so that I may say with Lucas Brugens. Præf. ad lectorem: Out of these Copies, "Si non ipsi judicium ferre, certè aliis dare, unde aut ferre possint, aut suo quemque momento varietatem æstimare—Non quasi Scriptura sacra erroribus obnoxia sit, quæ à prima veritate perfecta veritatis regula est, sed quòd in codices, sive apographa ipsa, Græca maximè et Latina, per frequentem exemplarium in exemplaria transfusionem, nunc librariorum, nunc lectorum oscitantia, incuria, inscitia, temeritate, labeculæ, errata, depravationesque irrepserint, quæ aliorum, codicum, sive apographorum collatione, mutari, corrigi, auferri debent." And what he saith of the Vulgar Latin, I know not but may be said of the Original Text. "Emendatè imprimi haud posse videtur, nisi collatis variis exemplaribus menda deprehensa eliminetur, sincera lectio administretur." For as follows, "hæret animi dubius quid amplectatur, donec ex fontibus, aut ex antiquis aliarum linguarum editionibus, aut ex tractatorum commentariis, aut ex locorum circumstantiis, aut ex ipsa exemplarium spectata inte-

gritate, aut denique ex his simul omnibus, quod inter exemplaria ipsa discernat, adferatur." Thus far this judicious author, who in a few words answers our Author's whole volume of *Considerations* about Various Readings.

IX. The Jews themselves, as I have said, take this course in their Editions of the Hebrew Text. They compare diverse Copies, and note the differences. Manasseh Ben Israel in his late Edition (much approved by divers) tells us of four Copies, that were *omnium correctissima,* which he compared together; and, when any difference offered itself, his refuge was to the Grammar rules, and the Masora; and adds, "Correctionem adhibui quàm diligentissimè, errata tum in punctis, tum in literis, atque adeò etiam in ipsis locorum aliquorum regulis, quæ in exemplaribus hactenus editis non pauca reperi, postquam ea diligentèr annotavi, fidelitèr omnia emendavi." Here we see this great rabbi found not a few errors crept in, and differences in the Hebrew Copies, which he corrected and amended. He might have learned of our Author, that his labour was needless; there can be no errors in the Text; that this was presumption to correct the Word of God!

X. To conclude this, let him consult Buxtorf's Vindic. who will inform him that there are diverse Various Readings in the Hebrew Text in our pre-

sent Copies, besides the Keri and the Ketib, and the rest above mentioned, some of which have been collected by others; and that he is so far from blaming those that collect them, that he wishes that more Copies were compared, and the Various Readings gathered, that "*a correct Copy might be made out of them all.* Non impedio quo minus codicum Hebraicorum variæ lectiones observentur, colligentur, imo etiam ex illis correctiones instituantur." Vindic. part 1. c. 4. p. 90. and p. 67. "Ex collatione exemplarium emendatum exemplar cudi potest, licèt non ad extremum usque apicem, (illud enim facilè concederem nec esse, nec fuisse, imo nec esse posse.)" More we have to the same purpose, Vind. lib. 2. c. 12. p. 834. "Quod (plures codices conferendo, discernendo, et dijudicando) ex Hebræis aggredi incepit post R. Ben Chajim editorem Bibl. majorum Venetorum R. Menachem Louzano in prima parte libri שרוי ירות per Pentateuchum: et optandum esset ut illius opera per cæteros quoque libros Biblicos continuasset, vel alius ei succederet." Again, Vindic. part 1. c. 12. p. 202. "Optandum esset ut quæ ab eo tempore sunt ab Hebræis ipsis variæ lectiones observatæ, ab aliquo colligerentur, ut Christianis etiam innotescerent, prout illarum multæ extant in Bibliis majoribus Venetis et Basil. Et nuper etiam R. Menachem Louzano in parte prima libri שרורת collegit ex

multis et probatissimis simul et antiquissimis libris Hebraicis quascunque observare potuit in lege Varias Lectiones. Imo si alibi in Bibliothecis quoque Regum, Principum, Urbium, exemplaria Hebraica extent, facilè patior ut conferantur; et si Lectiones Varias continerent, meliores eligantur." Here we see this learned Hebrician acknowledges Various Readings among the Hebrew Copies, besides those already noted, and this without prejudice to the purity of the Text; also wishes that as many Copies as can be procured were compared, the different readings gathered, out of which the best might be chosen, and so a more correct Edition might be made than any hitherto.

XI. This which he then wished to be done by others, is since done by himself: he hath collected out of all the Copies printed or MSS. which he could procure, all the Various Readings he could find, and hath written a full volume of them; wherein he gives also his judgment of them, which are best, which he offered once to be printed in our Bibles, (and if we could have had it in time, I should willingly have inserted it.) But he is now printing an Hebrew Bible at Basil, to which this his Critica Sacra is annexed; which, if it had not been stopt by some intervening accident in the vacancy of the Empire, had been finished ere now, as appears by Letters which I lately received from him. The Title of his Book,

as it was sent over by himself; for further satisfaction of the reader, I shall set down,

"JOH. BUXTORFII FILII CRITICA SACRA.

"*Seu Notæ in universos Veteris Testamenti libros Hebraicos:*

"*Quibus Variæ eorundem Lectiones, quæ vel scribarum seu typographorum, seu etiam correctorum imperitorum, et sciolorum, culpa hactenus irrepserint, partim ex probatis codicibus, partim ex Masora, quæ vetus est Hebræorum Critica, ostensa in plerisque locis genuina lectione dijudicantur.*

"*Opus ad novas Editiones in posterum castigatè edendas, et veteres emendendas utilissimum et necessarium à nemine Christianorum hactenus tentatum.*

"*Præmittitur Dissertatio D. V. qua Criticæ hujus sacræ origo, progressus, forma, et modus, totiusque hujus operis ratio et usus, plenius explicantur.*

"*Accedunt etiam Indices Variarum Lectionum inter Ben Ascher et Ben Naphtali, Orientalium et Occidentalium,*" &c.

XII. To these we might add, that the Keri and Ketib are not the same in all Editions, the num-

ber differing by some hundreds: our Author saith they are the same in all Editions, only in some the number varies by mistake and oversight, p. 296. Rather himself was mistaken and overseen when he wrote this! No man that looks upon them can imagine but that they were purposely so printed, and that according to the Copies which the publishers followed, and not by any mistake either of the printer or publisher. Some Editions have two or three hundred more than others, and can it be supposed that so many words could be added in the margin, with the Keri under them, and as many words marked in the Text, and to have the points affixed to them, which belong to the marginal word, and all this done by *casual mistake? Credat Judæus Apella;* I can hardly think that our Author himself upon deliberation will avouch it any more! The difference according to some chief Editions I have here transcribed out of the *Prolegomena,* that the reader may judge.

In Edit. Venet. Secunda.	*In Edit. Plant.*	*In Bibliis Regiis.*	*Elias Levita.*
Pentat. Ker. 73. Jeth. 1.	Ker. 74. Jeth. 1. Chas. 2.	Ker. 69. Jeth. 1. Chas. 1.	Ker. 65.
Megil. Ker. 51. Jeth. 11.	Ker. 43. Jeth. 14.	Ker. 48. Jeth. 8.	
Proph. prior. Ker. 337. Jeth. 11. Chas. 2.	Ker. 239. Jeth. 24.	Ker. 277. Jeth. 18. Chas. 5.	Ker. 454.
Proph. poster. Ker. 348. Jeth. 2.	Ker. 250. Jeth. 25. Chas. 1.	Ker. 347. Jeth. 11.	
Hagiogr. Ker. 362. Jeth. 60. Chas. 1.	Ker. 187. Jeth. 34. Chas. 1.	Ker. 242. Jeth. 20. Chas. 1.	Ker. 229.
Summa Totalis Ker. 1171. Jeth. 85. Chas. 3.	Ker. 793. Jeth. 99. Chas. 9.	Ker. 983. Jeth. 58. Chas. 7.	Ker. 848.

XIII. I hope by this our Author will believe there are some differences in the Hebrew Copies, and yet the Copies are not corrupt. When Buxtorf's Bible comes out, whereof part is already printed, this superstitious conceit of the Hebrew Copies not varying in any thing will clearly vanish. In the mean time he may look in Cappellus's Crit. lib. 3. c. 9. where he may find diverse Various Readings collected, besides the Keri and Ketib, out of the best Editions; and that not in points only, but in letters and words, and such as are not errors of the printer, but came from the difference of Copies, divers Translations, both ancient and modern, following one reading; and divers others, another: As Prov. xxi. 4. Plant, and Steph. have נֵר רְשָׁעִים *lucerna impiorum;* so read the LXX. Chald. and Vulgar Latin. But Bomberg. and Munst. in quarto read נֵר for נִיר, and Munst. in fol. hath נִיר *novale;* and so the Tigurin. and Junius; the last English translates it, *plowing*, and the French, *labouring*. Hos. xiii. 6. the Venice, Steph. Munster in quarto read אָשׁוּר *speculabor.* But in Plant. it is אַשּׁוּר *Assyria,* and so the LXX. and the Vulgar Latin read it. 1 Chron. i. 6. Bomb. and Munster in fol. read דופת with *daleth,* so Mas. par. Kimchi and Jarchi. But Plant. Steph. and Munst. in quarto read ריפת with *resh.*

So the LXX. and Vulgar Latin. In the same chapter, ver. 7. Bomb. reads *Rodanim*, רודנים, and the lesser Masora, Kimchi, and Jarchi, say it ought so to be read. But Plant. Steph. and Munst. in fol. and quarto read רודסים with *daleth*. 1 Chron. vi. 41. Plant. Bomb. and Steph. read, את עדי יהודה, but Munster fol. and quart. omits the word יהודה and so does the LXX. the Tigurin. and Castalio, and the later French Translations. Jos. xiv. 2. Steph. and Munst. fol. and quart. read ביד משה לתורת, so doth the Tigur. and Castalio, but Plant. and Bomb. leave out לתורת and so doth the LXX. Junius, the French and English. Josh. xxii. v. ult. after ובני גד Plant. leaves a void space, and notes in the margin, that עֵד *testis* is to be understood and supplied, and this is followed by Castal. the late English, and the French. But Steph. Bomb. and Arias Montanus omit עֵד, so doth the LXX. Vulgar Latin, and the Tigurin. Those that please may see more in Cappellus, in the place above mentioned; and if they consult Buxtorf's Vindic. they may see he dislikes not the collecting of such varieties out of Hebrew Copies, nor thinks that they infer the corruption of the Hebrew Copies.

XIV. What he objects about the same Various Readings served twice over, the Keri and Ketib over and over, &c. still shews his candour

and love of truth. Could he find no reason why the Keri and Ketib were twice enumerated, but to increase the bulk, and present the more variety to a less attentive reader? Read them over and blush. They are first reckoned up according to the order of the Books and Chapters, as they stand in the Bible, as they are in other Editions, that so the reader might know what is in each Book and Chapter; yet here they are with reference to the several chief Editions of the Bible, which differ much in the number, which was not done before in any Edition. And is there nothing in the second Catalogue but a bare enumeration of the same again? Any eye, not blinded with prejudice, might have seen some other benefit arising to the reader: For whereas they are of divers sorts and natures, they are all reduced to their several heads and classes, and the number of each sort examined, and the places quoted together where they are dispersedly mentioned throughout the Bible; and withal how many, and which of each sort, are acknowledged by each Edition; and withal some judgment given of most of them. Thus for example: There are some which are *not written* in the Text, a void space being left, or only the points without the letters, which yet are to be *read* as in the margin; of which sort are thirteen which are there mentioned, and the places mentioned where

they are to be found: some again are *written* in the Text, but *not read*, which have no points affixed, of which sort are five, which are there mentioned, with the places where they are to be found. Again, some are written *conjunctim* in the Text, as if they were one word, which as the marginal Keri notes must be read *divisim*, as two words, of which sort are eleven, or, as the little Masora saith, fifteen, which are also all specified together. Some again are written *severally*, as if they were *divers words*, which are to be read *jointly*, as one word, as the Keri notes, of which sort are eight. Again, some words there are which to those chaste rabbins seemed *obscene*, and therefore they put others *less offensive in the margin* to be read in their stead in the Synagogues, of which sort are ten, which are all enumerated; with some about *servile*, some about *radical letters*; some by *addition*, some by *detraction*, some by *transposition*, or *change of a letter*; some about *words*, &c. Of all which sorts, how many, and in what places they are, is distinctly set down, and what difference there is about them in the chief Editions, or in the Masora, or El. Levita. Now, can our cavilling Adversary find no use of all this, but only to increase the number? Is there not here much satisfaction to the reader to know how many there are of *each rank*, and where to be found? If he find

no benefit, he may forbear to look upon it, and leave it to others that can; let him find out every difference by the first Catalogue. Nor was this ordering of them the work of Cappellus alone, though he hath laboured more than any other therein. The same was done long before by Elias Lev. and in the Masora; in many, by Schindler, and Sixtin Amama, whose observations about these things were published long before Cappellus's Critica. That which is added about Grotius, is as void of truth as the rest. Are they given a third time in Grotius's notes, where there are scarce one or two mentioned in the whole Pentateuch, though there are above seventy? So in the 1st and 2d of Samuel, not above two mentioned among an hundred; and so for the rest. How great a bulk do these make, how is the volume swelled by them? Neither had these few been mentioned out of him, but that he gives his judgment of them. The like may be answered to what he saith of those of the New Testament. In the first collection they are barely named, with the Copies they relate to. In Grotius and Lucas Brugensis, their several judgments are given of so many as they took notice of. Now is it no benefit to the reader, to have the judgment of such learned men upon them, but all must be to increase the bulk?

XV. As he finds fault with the multitude of

the Various Readings, so he questions the Copies out of which they are gathered, and the fidelity of the collectors. "The Copies few or none are of any considerable antiquity," p. 195. "any book, though but of yesterday," p. 192. "he doubts whether these readings be tolerably attested to for Various Readings or no," p. 191. "Beza hath stigmatized his own Copy sent to Cambridge, to be so corrupt in the Gospel of Saint Luke, that he durst not publish the Various Readings of it, for fear of scandal," p. 195. "Besides, in that MS. Copy of Emmanuel College, which is only of the Epistles, many Various Readings are quoted, as out of the Gospels and Acts, with Col. Emman. prefigured. And it may be supposed that this mistake goes not alone; but upon examination of particulars, they will be found not so clearly attested, &c. He doubts not, but upon search, some of these Copies will be found no better than that Hebrew MS. of the Psalms, rejected by Arias Montanus, and therefore he earnestly exhorts some of his University to examine these Various Readings, &c." Here we may observe how little our *Considerator considered what he wrote*, but that he vented *quicquid in buccam venerat;* for how could he judge of the Copies and MSS. we used, which he never collated, and may be scarce ever saw any of them? I am sure they are the

choicest, and some of them the best antiquity in England, yea, some the ancientest that are this day in the world. And I can further aver, that some Copies I laid aside, which seemed to be of no antiquity, or negligently written; so far were we from taking up all that could be had, though but of yesterday. The greatest part of those of the New Testament were, as is said before, with great labour and charge, [B] sought out, and collated by the most reverend Usher, out of the best Libraries, public or private, in England; and I believe, he was as able to judge of a Copy as another. What thinks our Author of the [C] Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament in Greek, preserved in the King's Library, written in Capital Letters, without accents, or distinction either of words or sentences, one of the noblest MSS. in the world? which kind of writing hath been out of use for above a thousand years, as our best antiquarians conclude, and therefore this MS. must needs exceed that age. What of the [D] Codex Claromontanus, and of [E] that which Beza sent to Cambridge, written in the same manner? Most of the rest are of great antiquity. Not to insist upon [F] that Greek MS. of the Chronicles, brought out of Greece by Theodorus, who was Archbishop of Canterb. above a thousand years ago, which is now in Cambridge Library; nor of [G] that ancient remnant of Sir Robert Cotton's Greek

MS. of Genesis, esteemed by learned Usher the oldest MS. in the world; because these concern the Greek LXX. which is of no account with our Adversary. But what attestation desires he of the Copies? the most of them are in public Libraries, and may attest for themselves; he may exhort whom he will to examine the Copies and the Various Readings; if he can find them unfaithfully collected, let him publish it to the world, and not spare us. But how this will be done, unless they mean to collate all over again, I know not, and I doubt it will be found a labour, which neither he, nor any of his novices, will easily undergo.

XVI. But he instances in some Copies. Beza's *is stigmatized by himself:* but where had he this, but out of Beza's Epistle to the University, which he had not known if I had not published it? And if I had intended to deceive the reader, I might have suppressed it; whereas I have plainly declared my judgment on that Copy about the Genealogy of Christ, *Prolegom.* ix. 65. that in that point it is of no credit: yet why it might not be useful in other matters I know not; and considering the great antiquity of it, why it might not deserve to be collated amongst other Copies. Beza frequently makes use of it in his notes, and calls it, *Exemplar suum venerandæ antiquitatis;* and those that please may find it to agree with

our old Alexandrian MS. and other ancient Copies, and with the reading of divers ancient writers of the Church, where our later Copies do read otherwise; so that the concurrence of it with those ancient Copies may confirm the reading that is found in them, and so it may be of great use. And though Beza saith, he found so great discrepance in it from other Copies in Saint Luke, that to avoid the offence of some (weak persons) he thought fit rather to preserve it than to publish it, (which is all the *stigmatizing* here boasted of,) yet he adds, "In hac non sententiarum, sed vocum diversitate, nihil profectò comperi, unde suspicare potuerim à veteribus illis Hæreticis fuisse depravatum. Imo multa mihi videor deprehendisse observatione digna, quædam etiam sic à recepta scriptura discrepantia, ut tamen cum veterum quorundam et Græcorum et Latinorum Patrum scriptis consentiant, quæ omnia pro ingenii mei modulo inter se comparata, et cum Syra et Arabica Editione collata, in majores meas Annotationes à me nuper emendatas, et brevi (Deo favente) prodituras congessi." Here we see what use Beza made of this Copy, and how he *stigmatizes* it! If he had thought so basely of it as our Author, he would never have thought it worthy to be presented to such an University, nor they to preserve it as such a rare monument of antiquity.

XVII. As for that MS. of St. Paul's Epistles in

[H] Emmanuel College, though there was another MS. in the same College of the Gospels and Acts, whose name was casually omitted in the Catalogue, yet he can never prove any falsification, or indirect dealing. Here is no obtruding of any Various Readings out of a MS. which is not. Only the name of that MS. of the Gospels and Acts was not noted among the rest, and what great matter is this? Is the reader hereby deceived or abused with any forgery or untruth? The occasion of the omission was this. Those readings of that MS. came to hand after the rest were finished, and after the Catalogue of the MSS. was drawn up, ready for the press, whereby the name of this MS. was forgotten to be inserted among the rest in the Catalogue. Our Author himself confesseth that, in a work of this variety, it were a miracle that many things should not escape the eye of the most diligent observer; yet he cannot forbear to insinuate, "that there hath not been fair dealing in this collection, nor to raise suspicions, as if other things of the like nature might be found upon further search. This omission is not so great, as *his mistake* that says, that Morinus (now lately dead) was a Jesuit, a petulant Jesuit, p. 207. an aspiring Jesuit, p. 299. when any one that reads the title-page of any of his books, may see he was of the Oratorian Order, which was founded divers years after that of the

Jesuits; or, that the Oracles of God were committed to the Jews under the Old Testament, and all the Writings of the New, as we find, Ep. p. 3. and yet no notice taken of in the Errata; or to write, as p. 80. that the Various Readings of the Eastern and Western Jews appeared first in the Edition of the Bible by Bombergus, under the care of Felix Pratensis, gathered by R. Jacob Ben-Chajim, who corrected that impression; which is, as if one should say, that the Various Readings of the New Testament appeared first in Erasmus's Edition of the New Testament, gathered by Stephanus, who corrected that impression! Here are many mistakes, which shew that he never looked into any Edition of the Venice Bible; for Felix Pratensis, and Ben-Chajim never joined in one Edition of the Bible; one was by Felix Pratensis, another by Ben-Chajim: nor are those Various Readings gathered by Ben-Chajim, but were first published by Felix Pratensis, as he might have read in *Prolegom.* iv. sect. 14. or if he will not believe me, let him read Buxtorf's *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, p. 228, &c. and believe his own eyes. I could instance in more of this kind, if I thought it needful, nor should I have mentioned these, if he had not given me this occasion.

XVIII. He objects, that in these Various Readings, "There is no choice made, no judgment

used in discerning true from spurious, but all differences whatsoever, that could be found in any Copies, printed, or written, are equally given out; that the first observation in Lucas Brugensis, printed next to this Collection, rejects one of these varieties as a corruption," &c. I answer, 1. That is altogether untrue: for many differences in these Copies were left out, because they appeared plainly to be errors of the transcriber; and this I can certainly affirm; and therefore all differences of Copies are not here noted: Secondly, yet I deny not but that there may be divers remaining, which may come into that number, which I thought fit rather to leave to the reader's judgment, than to leave out every thing which seemed so to me; for that may seem to be a mistake of the scribe to one, which happily may be thought none in another's judgment; as appears in that which he saith is noted by Lucas Brugensis for a corruption, which yet he knows Robertus Stephanus reckoned among Various Readings; and Beza thought so well of it, that he preferred it before the common reading: nor doth Lucas Brugensis reject it as a corruption, but taxes Beza for preferring this reading upon the authority of one Copy before the common reading; but it seems, if one reading have more reason for it than another, the other must presently be a corruption in our Adversary's Logick, and yet it appears, that

there are more Copies than one which attest this reading; we have four more which concur in it, as appears in our collection, and I doubt it would trouble him to answer Beza's reasons for that reading. Thirdly, it is declared more than once in the *Prolegomena*, that every difference of a Copy is not properly a Various Reading. Vide *Prolegom.* vi. sect. 8. *Scribarum errores, de quibus certò constat, inter Varias Lectiones nequaquam referendi;* and therefore, (though the major part give the denomination to the whole, and all differences in a general sense may be called Various Readings,) if any who have leisure and abilities, shall survey them, and shall plainly prove, that some of them are errors of the transcriber, it shall be no offence at all to me, so it be not done *animo calumniandi*, without magisterial imposing their conceits upon others, and so that they leave to others the like liberty which they assume to themselves. Neither was it incumbent on us, (as our Author cannot but confess, and therefore answers himself,) to give our judgment upon every reading, which is the best; we had work enough besides: and therefore those that have so much leisure to cavil and quarrel at every thing, may do well to exercise their critical faculty herein; only I wish they may have better success than our Author hath in that specimen of his critical abilities about ἐπιλύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. p. 19,

20, &c. and that they would not be too forward in determining such to be corruptions, which, it may be, wiser and learneder men judge otherwise of. Fourthly, to give the several readings of ancient Copies of note, without passing any judgment of each, is no new thing. In what Edition of the Hebrew Bibles doth he find any judgment upon the Keri and Ketib in particular, and those other Hebrew varieties? or where doth he find any thing to this purpose, save what is done by Cappellus in his Critica, or by Buxtorf in his Bible now printing? Arias Montanus brings divers readings of the Greek, Chaldee, and Syriac, which are barely recited; so doth Stephanus in those which he gathered out of his sixteen Copies. Junius (who is thought to be the author of the Frankf. Edition of the Sept.) notes divers readings out of several Copies, but seldom gives any judgment of them. And if here the publisher had only selected some choice ones, as seemed good to himself, he had not left all to the reader's judgment, but subjected all to his own.

XIX. But our Author might have observed, that the design of the Edition was not only to exhibit to the reader all the ancient and chief Translations, together with the Originals, but also the chief Copies, MS. or others, of both, that so in this Edition the reader might have all or most other Editions, and the best MSS. which

he might consult at pleasure. The particular MSS. belonging to several libraries, either in the Universities or Colleges, or of private persons, who were great gatherers of monuments of antiquity, have been justly accounted great treasures. Who would not set a high esteem upon those Copies and MSS. here collated, if he had them all in his own keeping? Now care is taken that every private man may have them, and use them as his own. This pains I see was ill bestowed upon such as make so ill use of it, as to throw the Copies like dirt in our faces, and thereby take occasion to calumniate our labours. Besides, though some of these differences seem small, yet they may be of more use hereafter than appears at present, upon the rising of new Errors and Heresies; which I confess was one reason, why the fewer were left out, because we could not know, nor foresee, what use might be made of them hereafter, though they seem less useful at present: and therefore it was resolved to give them as they are; which, considering the many cautions and rules about them, [I] *Prolegom.* vi. De Variis Lectionibus, to stop the mouth of calumny, and prevent all just cause of offence, I conceived might be justly done.

CHAPTER VIII.

I. *The consequences inferred by the Adversary from the Various Readings, on the behalf of Atheists, Papists, Fanatical Persons, Mahometans.* II. *He proves none of them.* III. *The inconsequence shewed.* IV. *The words of Sixtin Amama.* V. *Of Bochartus, Lud. De Dieu, &c.* VI. *Erasmus: The same words used by the Friars against him, which this Adversary uses against the Biblia Polyglotta.* VII. *No error or mistake is capable of cure by his rules. The words for themselves.* VIII. *The Adversary's argument retorted upon himself. He pleads for Papists, Atheists, &c. grants, yea, urges, both the premises; only denies the conclusion.* IX. *That he is guilty of what he accuses others.* X. *Various Readings give no advantage to Papists, Atheists, Antiscripturists, or Mahometans, as is shewn in particular.*

I. HAVING gone over these particulars about Various Readings, I might forbear to say any thing more of that subject, of which enough is said to satisfy any rational reader; but because our Adversary doth frequently, from what is said by us, and confessed by himself, labour to infer certain false and pernicious consequences against the certainty and supreme authority of Scripture, on the behalf of Atheists, Papists, Fanatics, Antiscripturists, and Mahometans, we shall briefly consider the force of those consequences, whether

they do justly follow from any principle by us acknowledged in the *Prolegomena*, or *Appendix*. Our Author sometimes seems not to be resolved of the truth of his consequence. P. 147, he saith, "these Various Lections do, at the first view, seem to intimate that the Originals are corrupt;" p. 159. "they seem sufficient to beget scruples, &c." p. 156. "these *Prolegomena* seem to impair the truth, &c." p. 147. "men of perverse minds may possibly wrest these things." Nay, p. 206, he saith, "that the Prefacer doth not own those wretched consequences." Now, if they do but *seem* sufficient, and if they be *wrested* by men of *perverse minds*, then those consequences do not necessarily follow: *no genuine consequence can be said to be wrested, nor will he, I hope, join with men of perverse minds.* And if the Author of the *Prolegomena* do not own them, then they ought not to be objected against him, without sufficient proof of the consequences, which these *Considerations* do no where afford. But in other places he speaks more positively: p. 205, "They are all directed," or "by just consequence owned in the *Prolegomena*;" p. 206, "that no sufficient security against the lawful deriving of them is tendered;" p. 161, "that they are an engine fitted for the destruction of that important truth by him pleaded for, and as a fit weapon

put into the hands of atheistical men, to oppose the whole evidence of truth revealed in the Scripture, &c.;" p. 207, "Great and wise men," (*of which himself is one without doubt,*) "do suppose them naturally, and necessarily, to flow from them." And, therefore, p. 147, he *absolutely* affirms, "They are, in brief, the foundation of Mahometanism, the chiefest and principal prop of Popery, the only pretence of fanatic Antiscripturists, and the root of much hidden Atheism in the world."

II. Now we know the rule is, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio,* and therefore our Adversary ought to prove and make good his consequences, or else he must be accounted a false accuser. Yet here we do not find that he offers any thing in this kind, to prove that they do follow from any principles in the *Prolegomena*; but as he substitutes what he pleases, instead of his Adversary's tenets; so he infers at random any thing that came into his mind, whereby to make them odious to vulgar readers. The injustice of his charge may sufficiently appear by what is already said, and therefore I shall only recapitulate the sum of what is formerly proved, reinforcing some particulars; and then shew, that the charge may reflect upon himself, as being deeply guilty, by his own confession, of what he would impute unto another.

III. That no such inference can be made against the certainty, integrity, and supreme authority of Scripture, from any thing affirmed in the *Prolegomena*, may appear, because, as is at large shewed, *The Prolegomena do not affirm the Original Texts to be corrupt, but to be pure and authentic, of supreme authority, the rule of faith and life, and of all Translations. The Various Readings of the Original Texts do not infer the corrupting of the Text, but may well stand with the purity and authority thereof. That our Author affirms the same with the Prolegomena, about Various Readings, which he frequently confesseth to be both in the Old Testament and the New. And as for those Various Readings out of Translations which he would not allow, they are of the same nature with those which he allows out of the original Copies: for the Prolegomena say they are in matters of no moment, contain nothing repugnant to the analogy of faith, and such are by himself allowed in the Hebrew and Greek. That the most learned Protestant divines, and best skilled in the Oriental Tongues, and most zealous defenders of the Original Texts, have said the same with the Prolegomena, and in some things more; such as Luther, Calvin, Beza, Mercer, Brentius, Oecolampadius, Pellican, Scaliger, De Dieu, Sixtin Amama, Archbishop Usher, and*

in a manner, all others, who would never be so inconsiderate, as to affirm and deny the same thing, or to give back to their adversaries with one hand, what they have taken from them with the other. And though I have both in *Proleg.* vi. sect. 2. and in this answer cited divers of their words, yet I shall here add something more, with their reasons against the consequences here objected, and those of such men whom he cannot in the least suspect of inclining to Rome.

IV. Sixtin Amama, late Hebrew Professor at Franeker, one whom our Author in his Epist. p. 9, joins with Whitaker, Reynolds, Junius, Chamier, Amesius, and others, "that have stopt the mouths of Romanists speaking against the Original Texts, and quenched the fire which they would put to the house of God," as he expresses it; this man, in that excellent book called *Antibarbarismus Biblicus,* which is wholly in defence of the Hebrew Text, writes thus, lib. 1, "Haud negare ausim, et injuria temporum, et descriptorum incuria, errata quædam et sphalmata in Textum Hebraicum irrepsisse. Hoc autem dum admittimus, authoritati Textus Hebraici nihil detrahimus; manet nihilominus Textus authenticus, et omnium versionum norma." Afterwards he adds, "ex omnibus variantibus lectionibus proferatur una, unde vel orthodoxæ

fidei, vel pietati, ullum detrimentum inferri possit? Certè his talibus nullam intervenisse Judæorum malitiam non tantùm hinc apparet quòd nullum ex illis Judaicæ perfidiæ patrocinium exsculpi possit, sed et ex eo quòd fontes variarum lectionum assignari possunt, inter quos primarii sunt, affinitas soni vel affinitas figuræ consonantis, vel indifferentia sensus, &c. Quin et illud consideratione dignum in istis infirmitatis humanæ erratis et παροράμασι non dormitasse vigilem providentiæ divinæ oculum, dum cavit diligentissimè ne vel minima orthodoxæ fidei particula, vel pietas, ex eorum usu detrimentum capiat."

V. To him let us add Bochartus, Minister at Caen, in France, a man no less eminent for his various learning, than for his zeal and piety, in that admirable Work of his, his *Geographia Sacra*, Part I. l. ii. c. 13, part of whose words I have formerly cited, who writes thus; "Licèt eandem scribis non tribuam ἀναμαρτησιαν quam scriptoribus sacris, non tamen indè sequitur, quòd nonnulli subindè oggerunt, actum esse de fide et salutis doctrina, et in ea nihil esse certi: Quis enim ferat in aliis sic arguentem? In Livii et Suetonii scriptis quidam errores irrepserunt: ergo in Historia Romana nihil est certi; et in iis quæ de Hannibale, aut Julio, aut Augusto leguntur, nutat fides! Aristotelis Græci codices alicubi sunt mendosi: ergo quid ille scripserit de rebus Phi-

losophicis certò scire haud possumus! Quamvis exemplum sit valdè dispar! Nam multò aliter invigilavit Dei Providentia ut Sacræ Scripturæ codices præstaret immunes, saltem in ïis quæ ad fidem et salutem sunt absolutè necessaria: unde est, quòd ut ut Hebræi et Græci codices variant in minutulis, et Sacri Textus interpretes sæpè in diversa abeunt, tamen in fidei capitibus, et τῷ νόμῳ τοῖς βαρυτέροις, eadem ubique doctrina occurrat, non jam dicam in αὐτογράφοις, sed et in versionibus corruptissimis." What could be more fully said to shew the vanity of our Author's consequence? The same we may read in Lud. de Dieu, a man of great learning, especially in the Oriental tongues, as his works proclaim, Præf. in Animadvers. in Evangel. "Nec est quod quenquam turbet ea codicum lectionumque varietas, quasi nihil certi haberet fides Christiana cui inniteretur; nihil enim deprehendo quod fidei substantiam læderet—Tantum abest ut Erasmum, Camerarium, Bezam, viros pietate et eruditione conspicuos, culpare audeam, quod in suis ad sacros libros notis varias lectiones observarint, ut contra eos utilem operam navasse credam." Here we see the same arguments which our Adversary brings about the uncertainty of Scripture propounded, and the same answer given which we have given already. They shew the inconsequence of his argument, and acknowledge the

great usefulness of gathering Various Readings; and further (which is to be observed) they do not only allow of Various Readings out of the Original Texts, but also out of Translations, which they often practise themselves, and sometimes prefer before the common reading, as we have shewed, *Proleg.* vi. sect. 9.

VI. I will mention one more, Erasmus, whom our Author names as the first and chiefest that laboured in this kind, p. 189, and Epist. p. 21, whose pains likewise he tells us were calumniated by some in his time. He wrote indeed a whole volume of Apologies for his several Works, and in this particular he was railed upon most by ignorant Friars, who used the same words, which are now taken up by this Author against us, for the same thing. He compared divers Copies of the New Testament, to make his Edition the more perfect, and several Translations and expositions of the ancients; whereupon as appears, Epist. ad Henr. Bovillum, they cried out, "quasi protinus actum esset de Religione Christiana — vociferantur, οὐρανὲ σχίλιαζε, O coelum, O terra, corrigit hic Evangelium!". So here they bring in *utter incertainty* about all sacred truth, Epist. p. 25; they *correct the Scripture*, p. 344; *correct the Word of God*, p. 180. And Annot. 1, in Leum, in answer to Lee, objecting the same thing, he saith, "Ostendat nobis suo digito

Deus, quæ sit illa lectio quam dictavit Sp. S. et, hanc unam amplexi, quicquid ab hac variat rejiciemus. Quod si ille non potest; ex collatione linguarum et exemplarium, ex lectione, ex Translationibus celebrium auctorum, nobiscum scrutetur quæ lectio sit maxime probabilis."

VII. If our Adversary's rule had been received, that no errors can befal the Text, either by malice, or negligence, there had never been any correct Edition made by any: and if it had been thought unlawful, in any case, to question the common reading, men might have spared their labour, who from time to time, by comparing Copies and other helps above mentioned, have endeavoured to make exact Editions, both of the Hebrew and Greek, which we see yet was at several times practised both by Jews and Christians; Ben Ascher, Ben Naphtali, R. Hillel, Ben Chajim, Manass. Ben Israel, Buxtorf, Arias Montanus, Erasmus, Stephens, Beza, and others, who altered and amended what they found by mistake had crept into the common or vulgar Copies; and whose labours, either by explicit or tacit consent of the Church, receiving them without gainsaying, have been approved and commended. Whereas if nothing must be amended, as nothing must upon our Adversary's supposal, all errors that shall happen are incapable of cure, because we must suppose there can be none, and

so considering that errors will now and then happen (notwithstanding all possible diligence) as all men, even himself, do grant, a plain way is opened to the utter corruption and depravation of the whole Scripture; and so the case will be the same with the Roman Church, or the Pope, to whom the Jesuits affix infallibility, whereby all the errors are become incurable, though never so palpable, because it must be supposed they are subject to none. I conclude this with that speech of Heinsius, a great defender of the original Texts, *Proleg. in Nov. Test.* "Serio responso haud digni sunt, qui aut variasse olim in quibusdam libros, aut ex iis minus emendatos cum cura restitutos, negant." And after; "Satis sit ejusmodi varietates eas esse, ut vel quæ necessariò credenda sunt non evertant, vel quæ non credenda sunt non doceant."

VIII. But now as I have cleared the *Proleg.* and *Appendix* from these consequences of the Adversary, so his argument, like a piece of ordnance overcharged, recoils with full strength upon himself; nor can all the sophistry in the world free him from the guilt which he charges upon us. For he not only grants the same proposition which we do, concerning Various Readings, but also grants, yea urges, the consequence which Papists, Atheists, &c. would infer thence, and which not we only, but all sober men utterly

deny, only he denies the conclusion. For thus the argument runs, if it be reduced into syllogistical form. *If there be Various Readings in the Original Texts of Scripture, then the Scripture is uncertain, corrupt, and doubtful, and so cannot be of supreme authority, whereby way is made for Popery, Atheism, &c. But there are Various Readings in the Original Texts of Scripture: Ergo, the Scripture is uncertain and corrupt, &c.* This *conclusion* we both deny, as false and impious; and therefore one or both the *propositions*, from which it is inferred, must needs be false. The *minor* is granted by the Author of the *Prolegomena*, as it is also by the Author of the *Considerations* in the places alleged, and by all men that will believe their eyes. But the *major*, or the *consequence*, is denied by the *Prolegomena*, and by all that have not joined hands with Papists, Atheists, &c. who do utterly deny that any such inference can be made from the Various Readings, but that the authority and certainty of the Scripture is still the same, which the Author of the *Prolegomena* not only affirms, but proves and gives reasons for it; and upon this he lays the weight of the cause, which neither our Adversary, nor all the Atheists, Papists, or Antiscripturists in the world are able to overthrow. On the other side our Author not only grants the *minor*, because it is evident to sense,

but grants the *major* too, yea, he urges the consequence all along in these *Considerations*, with much earnestness and vehemency, (which all sober Christians abhor and deny.) Now let all men judge, who is guilty of this wretched conclusion, he that grants the *proposition*, which is so evident that none can deny it, but denies the *consequence*, and gives reasons against it, or he that grants both *major* and *minor*, and denies only the *conclusion*.

IX. If it shall be said, that the *Considerations* do sometimes deny, that Various Readings infer the uncertainty and corruptions of the Scripture; I answer, it is true, that sometimes he seems to deny any such inference. But when he is in hot prosecution of his Adversary, he affirms the clean contrary, as appears by his whole second Chapter of the *Considerations*, and chap. 7. sect. 6. where he denies any difference in Copies, either wilfully or by negligence. And the third Chapter of his *Considerations* is wholly spent against the Various Readings of the New Testament, which are only out of Greek MSS. and tells us, p. 193. "that they create a temptation, that there is nothing sound and entire in the Word of God," p. 206. "that the consequences are lawfully derived," p. 207 "that they do naturally and necessarily flow;" so p. 147. 161, &c. All along throughout his Discourse, he infers from the

Various Readings in the *Appendix of the Bible*, (which are all out of the Original Texts, not any gathered out of Translations,) that thereby is introduced utter uncertainty about all sacred truth; so that nothing is more clear than that he makes the consequence of the uncertainty and corruption of the Scripture, to be the necessary product of Various Readings, and therefore that he hath plainly prevaricated, and betrayed the cause which he seemed to contend for; and his friends, as he makes them, Papists, Atheists, and fanatic persons, have cause to thank him for disputing so doughtily on their behalf. And so I conclude with that of Seneca, Controv. 3. l. 4. "Malo est in loco, qui habet rei fortunam, accusatoris invidiam:" *He is in an ill case, who accuses another of what himself is guilty:* for guilt, as one observes, though it be the effect of some error, yet usually it begets a kind of moderation in men, so as not to be violent in accusing others of that which may reflect upon themselves; but here we see it otherwise; and from what root it proceeds, I leave to every man's judgment.

X. Having shewed the no consequence of the uncertainty and corruption of the Scripture from Various Readings, I shall not need to stand long upon the particulars of Popery, Atheism, fanatical Antiscripturism, and Mahometanism, mentioned by him, p. 147. For "Popery he fears

the pretended infallible guide, &c. will be found to lie at the door" of the Considerations, p. 161. and p. 202. He doubts not but to hear "news from Rome concerning these varieties, there having been no such collections as yet made, in the world. Enough they are to fright poor unstable souls, into the arms of an infallible Judge." And p. 207. "We went from Rome under conduct of the purity of the Originals; I wish none have a mind to return thither again, under pretence of their corruption." How these Various Readings should be any prop, much less the principal pillar of Popery, I cannot see, nor doth our Author prove. His meaning it may be is, that Papists do hence infer the Scripture to be uncertain, and the Original Texts to be corrupt, so that they can be no sure ground of faith, and therefore that all must fly to an infallible Judge, and rely upon the Vulgar Latin. But these grounds we have already taken away, and proved, that notwithstanding such Various Readings, the Scriptures are still the certain rule of faith, and the Original Texts the authentic rule of all Translations: Vid. *Proleg.* vii. Besides, let our Author shew that any of the Various Readings, by us collected, contain any thing against either faith or good life, or make for the Romanists in any of the Controversies between them and us; let him instance in any if he can. In that place of 1 John v. 7. are some words

left out in many ancient Copies, but there is nothing contrary to the analogy of faith inserted. That point of the Trinity hath ground enough besides in Scripture, though these words had not been in any copy; and whether they were rased out of some Copies by the Arians, as some of the ancients suppose, or whether left out by casual error of the transcriber in some one Copy from which many others were derived, and that error made use of by the Arians, yet here is nothing against faith affirmed in this place, only an omission of some words in some Copies. Besides how can it be imagined that these Various Readings should make way for Popery, when the first and chief collectors of them were the chief opposers of Popery? as this Author affirms, p. 189. where he reckons up Stephanus, Beza, Camerarius, Drusius, Heinsius, Grotius, de Dieu, Cappellus.

XI. If it be said, that Papists make use of these Various Lections to decry the Originals, and to set up the Vulgar Latin, or from their uncertainty to infer the necessity of an infallible Judge; 1. it is true there be some that do so, but there are some, and those of the most learned among them, who are stout defenders of the purity of the Original Texts, and prefer them before the Vulgar Latin, as Simeon de Muis, Joh. D'Espieres, and others; and many among them

who maintain that the Council of Trent, in declaring the Vulgar Latin to be authentic, did no way derogate from the Hebrew and Greek Text, but only preferred the Vulgar Latin before all other Latin Translations, and meant only, that it contained nothing contrary to faith and good manners, as Salmer. Serrar. Mariana, Azor, Driedo, Vega, and divers others. 2. Doth our Adversary think that the Papists can justly deduce any such conclusions from the Various Readings? If he think so, then he pleads their cause, and joins hands with them against the Original Texts; if no, Why doth he urge their deductions against us? 3. Though some men pervert and abuse the truth to bad ends, must the truth therefore be denied, because a bad use is made of it? There never wanted those who perverted the Scripture to their own destruction; but is the Scripture the worse, or must not the lawful use of it be permitted? All truth is from God, the Author of truth, he needs not men's policies to defend it, much less can it be upheld by untruths. Those pious frauds, when discovered, have proved prejudicial to the truth for which they were devised.

XII. He confesseth, p. 206. "That the Prefacer doth not own these wretched consequences, but he knows full well who think them to be just." It is true, he knows some Romanists and others think so, and it seems our Author thinks

so too. But this Author knows also, that the Preacer hath clearly proved, both against the Papist and himself, that the consequence is false and invalid, and that neither of them have just cause to think so; and therefore, that this ought not to be by him objected. It had been a more Christian practice for him to shew the inconsequence of such conclusions from such premises as are confessed by himself, than to play fast and loose, or to calumniate them, who granting what cannot be denied, no not by himself, do yet uphold the authority of the Scripture, and labour to prove that no such things do follow as are by such men surmised.

XIII. His uncharitable intimation, as if the design of the publisher of the Various Readings were to return to Rome again, to an infallible Judge, reflects upon the chief defenders of the Protestant profession against the errors of Rome; and the supposition is as true as the position, in that flower of his discourse, (twice repeated, p. 161. and 282. *(Hoc Ithacus velit,)* if the rest of the verse *(et magno mercentur Atridæ)* be added to it. It is well known, that the Author of the *Prolegomena*, when he kept his Act *pro Gradu*, at Cambridge, about twenty years ago, maintained this Question: *Pontifex Romanus non est judex infallibilis in controversiis fidei:* And he professeth himself to be still of the same judg-

ment, and to be rather more confirmed in that persuasion, than any way doubtful of it. And what news can we expect from Rome concerning these Various Readings, when the same thing is not new with them, as appears by the notes of Lucas Brugensis, Nobilius, and others, which far exceed in bulk any thing that we have done, and wherein more MSS. were used? which labours of theirs have ever been of high esteem among the learnedest Protestants, as well as those of their own party. And how can they justly object these Various Readings against us, when far more have been observed by themselves in the Vulgar Latin, which yet they will not have to derogate from its supreme authority?

XIV. For his Atheists, I wish he had considered better his own doctrine, p. 88, 104, 108, 110, &c. whether the taking away of one chief argument to demonstrate the Divine Original of Scripture, against Atheists and Unbelievers, viz. "the miracles wrought for confirmation of the doctrine, brought down and witnessed to us by the universal tradition of the Church of Christ, and the affirming that we have no more reason to believe there were any such miracles upon the tradition of the Church of Christ, than we have to believe those who deny they have any such tradition, (that is, Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans;) and that the Alcoran may, upon this ground,

vie with the Christian Church;"—Whether the affirming these things gives not more advantage to Atheists, than to affirm that there are Various Readings in Scripture, in matters that do not concern faith or salvation, nor in any thing of weight, by the casual mistakes of transcribers; This I am sure gives no advantage in the least: and if Atheists will pervert and abuse the truth upon such principles, why will our Author, (who would not be reckoned amongst them,) put them in mind of such advantages, and not rather leave the urging of them to Hobbes and his fellows? Let him remember what Sixt. Amama hath written against this, Antibar. lib. i. which I know he hath read, *Prolegom.* vi. sect. 5. "Qui ne minimas à Textu Originario variationes dari posse defendunt, in laqueos et modos inexplicabiles se involvunt, simulque impiis et profanis hominibus (quorum haec aetas feracissima) se ridendos praebent, qui facilè observent in libris Regum et Chronicorum, et alibi quaedam ἄκυρα, ut in 2 Reg. xxii. 8. collato cum 2 Chron. xxii. 3. de aetate Ahaziae filii Joram, unde colligunt nullam esse in sacris literis certitudinem, nec iisdem fidem adhibendam: Quibus facilè os obstruitur, cum haec ex variante codicum lectione, non ex ipso textu ἀυτογράφῳ oriri dicimus, unde consequentia illa nullum habet robur."

XV. The like may be said for his fanatic

Antiscripturists. The certainty and divine authority of Scripture hath been made good notwithstanding such Various Readings, and therefore no just ground can be hence gathered of rejecting the Scriptures. He tells us of a Treatise written by somebody, who upon such principles rejects the whole Scriptures as useless. I can say nothing of the book which I have not seen, nor known upon what principle it proceeds. If our Author think his Arguments to be good, let him produce them, and I doubt not but they will be quickly answered. In the mean time he may please to consider, whether he that rejects all other proofs for the Divine Original of Scripture, and relies only upon its own light and self-evidence, which is denied in this case to be sufficient by many learned Protestants, do not give greater occasion to those, who brag of their *new lights*, and daily increase amongst us, to reject all Scripture as useless, than he that allows such Various Readings in the Scripture as we have declared; and whether the levelling of all discipline and order of government in the Church, and leaving every man to follow his own fancy, against both Old and New Testament, which tell us, *That they should seek the Law at the Priest's mouth,* and *that they who will not hear the Church, are to be accounted as Publicans and Heathens,* have not made way to those An-

tiscripturists, Familists, and other Sectaries, which swarm among us, and like the *locusts that came out of the bottomless pit, have overspread the land, and darkened the sun!*

XVI. Lastly, for Mahometanism: It is true, Mahomet accuseth the Jews of corrupting the Old Testament, and the Christians for corrupting the New, and saith, that he was sent of God to reform all, *Surat.* iv. 5. 11. And some of his followers pretend that there was something altered in John xiv. about the *Comforter* which Christ promised to send, as if there had been something in that place foretold of Mahomet, which the Christians have rased out and corrupted. But doth our Author believe that any Various Readings gathered out of any MSS. or printed Copies, or ancient Translations, do intimate any such thing of Mahomet, or favour any part of his impious doctrine? I am sorry to see any man so transported, as to urge such things, which must reflect upon the most eminent divines and chief lights of the Church, in this or former ages, yea, upon himself in a high measure, who affirms the same about Various Readings which those do, against whom he makes this inference.

CHAPTER IX.

I. *The occasion pretended of this invective against the Translations of the Biblia Polyglotta.* II. *His mistakes about the Arabic. The Publisher of the Arabic, the same with the Publisher of the Biblia Polyglotta.* III. IV. *The Adversary misreports Mr. Pocock's Preface. His contradictions.* V. VI. *The Syriac vindicated from his aspersions. The antiquity of it proved.* VII. *His carping at the Cambridge Copy.* VIII. *The Samaritan Pentateuch vindicated.* IX. X. XI. *His Paradoxes about the Samaritan Pentateuch.* XII. *Set forms of Liturgy proved from the Jews after Esdras's time, and from the Samaritans in imitation of them.* XIII. *The Chaldee Paraphrase defended. Of Buxtorf's Babylonia.* XIV. *Of the Vulgar Latin.* XV. *The Septuagint defended: the other Translations not taken from it, save part of the Arabic.* XVI. *Of the Original Copy of the Septuagint.* XVII. *Of the Ethiopic and Persian.* XVIII. *The true reason why the Adversary is so offended with these ancient Translations, they testify for Liturgy, observation of Festivals, &c.*

I. BEFORE we leave this charge about Various Readings, I must say something of the Translations exhibited in the *Biblia Polyglotta*; against which our Author spends his last chapter, upon pretence, that we assign them another use than he allows, viz. *That they are the rules by which the Original is to be corrected*; for upon this

he takes occasion to inveigh against them all, to shew how unfit they are for this end, and further, how unuseful for any other end. Now, though I might well pass over all that is said upon this supposition, as not concerned therein, having already declared for what use these Translations are here printed; and that though we allow Various Readings to be gathered out of them in some cases, and with some limitations, as is above declared, yet we neither make them equal with, much less prefer them above, the Originals, but make them subservient to them; yet, because under colour of this he defames and asperses all the Translations as of no use, nor deserving any esteem, I shall take a brief view of the most material passages in this invective, referring the reader for full satisfaction to the *Prolegomena*, where the use, antiquity, and authority of every Translation, and all the questions about any of them, are at large handled.

II. He prefaces his invective with an acknowledgment of the usefulness of them in some cases, and p. 206, calls the work, *a noble collection of Translations*: but this is, as I said before, only as a shoeing-horn to draw on the better this aspersion which he casts upon them afterwards, and therefore I account his commendation to be only, as I observed before out of St. Jerom, *honorifica contumelia*, an *honourable reproach*.

First, he begins with the [K] Arabic, for the honour he bears to the renownedly learned publisher of it, as he affirms, (meaning Master Pocock,) or rather indeed, because he thought he might have more colourable pretence to vilify this Translation than some of the other, otherwise he should rather have passed it over, or said least of it, if he had so *honoured the publisher*. But here he shews how apt he is to mistake or to derogate what he can from the publisher, when he makes that learned man the publisher of the Arabic. I shall not detract from his deserved praise, whom I do esteem as my much honoured friend; but I am sure he will not thank him for making use of any thing by him said or written, against this or any other of the Translations, nor assume to himself what our Author gives him, to be the publisher of the Arabic Translation, or any other in this Edition; for upon the request of the publisher, he collated the Pentateuch, not the whole Translation, with two Copies of Saadias's Translation, (which he takes to be the same with that in the Parisian, and in this Edition,) the one a MS. the other printed in the Constantinopolitan Bibles; and noted the differences of them, which he sent to the publisher; which after they were reviewed, and collated over again for a great part, with the printed Copy of Saadias, which I had out of Mr. Selden's Library, (for many things

were mistaken by some whom he employed in part of the collation, which himself, being otherwise employed, had not leisure to review, and therefore desired me that they might be re-examined,) I caused to be printed and published with the rest. And upon the like request of the publisher, that he would make some brief Preface to those Arabic Various Readings or differences of these Copies, he sent him that which is now prefixed to them, in which, though the publisher did not concur with him that this Pentateuch is the same with that of Saadias, wherein divers others of great learning and judgment did concur with the publisher; nor did his reasons seem cogent, considering them on the one side, and what was brought by D. Hottinger, now Hebrew Professor at Heidelberg, on the other side, in his *Analecta*, which are further urged in his *Smegma Orientale*, with other reasons which offered themselves; and although the publisher had formerly inclined to Mr. Pocock's opinion, swayed by his authority, which he always did, and doth still, very much esteem; and did foresee, and so declared, what use might be made of his words by some persons disaffected to the work, to the defaming of the whole, as I now find by experience: yet seeing it was only his particular judgment, and every man had liberty to judge of his reasons as he saw cause, (some things also

being mollified and altered upon the publisher's Letters, from the first draught,) he chose rather to publish it as it is, than to take upon him to determine any thing in it, having also said something of this point, *Prolegom.* xiv. which the reader may consult, if he please.

III. I shall not therefore go about to discuss or determine that Question, whether it be the same which Saadias the Jew translated out of Hebrew into Arabic, yet in Hebrew characters, (though it seems scarcely credible, that those Christian Churches in the East should use a Translation made by a Jew in their public assemblies;) yet I cannot but observe how our Adversary doth misreport and wrong the learned Author of that Preface, in reciting his words and opinions, whom yet he seems to magnify, and therefore it is the less to be wondered that he deals so with others, whom he labours what he can to vilify: for he makes him to write things neither true, nor agreeing to common sense, but untrue, and contradictory to themselves: For, p. 922, he saith, "That he," (viz. Mr. Pocock,) "tells us, this Translation is a Cento made up of many ill-suited pieces, there being no Translation in that language extant of the Old Testament;" which is a plain contradiction; for if there be no Translation in the Arabic extant, how came this to be extant, and why doth he call it an Arabic

Translation, if there be none in that language? and why doth he speak, p. 324, "of other Arabic Translations," if there be none at all? Mr. Pocock indeed saith, That it is not all made by one Author, nor all immediately out of the Hebrew, but some out of the Hebrew, some out of the Syriac, and part out of the LXX. but he was not so devoid of common sense, as to say there was none at all. I looked among the Errata, but could not find any error noted there: nor can he say, that there is no other Translation in the Arabic but this, and that this was his meaning, for himself tells us of divers other Translations: and he could not but see in the *Prolegom.* xiv. mention made of divers Translations made by Christians since they were in subjection to the Mahometans, who propagated the Arabic tongue where they came, as that by the Bishop of Seville, in Spain, in 700, and two other famous ones, the Alexandrian or Egyptian, which Gab. Sionita published in the Paris Bible, and the Antiochian, used in that Patriarchate, as was shewed out of the Psalter Nebiense, and others, of both which MSS. Copies are remaining in the Vatican, as Cornelius à Lapide informs us, who made use of both. All that Mr. Pocock saith out of Abulfeda, is only, that there was no Arabic Version out of the Hebrew before his time in Arabic letters, not denying but that there were

Arabic Translations out of the LXX. and the Syriac long before, and that there might be also some out of the Hebrew into Arabic, but not in Arabic characters. Again he makes Mr. Pocock say, that the ancientest part of that Translation was made about the year 950, which he doth no where affirm, but only saith that the Pentateuch, which he ascribes to Saadias, was about that time, which is not denied, if it be his; but when any of the other parts were translated, he saith nothing.

IV. Further, he makes him say, "That this Translation of Saadias was interpreted, and changed in sundry things," &c. which he no where saith. He saith, that it was transcribed out of Hebrew characters, as we see in the Constantinopol. Pentateuch (which the Jews used in their Translations) into Arabic, by one who might change some words. But what is this to a translation or interpretation? Was the Pentateuch translated into Arabic, when the Hebrew letter was changed into Arabic? Besides he no where makes the interpreter to have been a Mahometan, or Samaritan, as this Author misreports him, but to be R. Saadias a Jew; but that he who transcribed, or put it into Arabic characters, might change some words, to comply the better with Mahometans, under whom those Christians lived. And lastly Mr. Pocock tells us, that these

things he cannot affirm upon certain and undoubted grounds, but only upon probable reasons. Thus modestly he writes. Whereas this Author speaks confidently of things which he never understood. Now if any desire to know what use may be of this Arabic Version, what Copies we used, what Translations there are, he may peruse if he please *Proleg.* xiv. where he shall not find any such use, either of this, or any other Translation as our Adversary feigns, viz. *to correct the Originals*, or, as he elsewhere expresses it, *to correct the Word of God.*

V. In the next place he falls upon the [L] Syriac, that noble, ancient, Oriental treasure, made immediately out of the Hebrew, of which he tells us, he believes some part of it was made out of the Hebrew, as if the major part were out of the LXX. or some other Translation, which all, that know of it any thing, know to be utterly untrue. Sometimes it varies in some words (of no importance) from our modern Hebrew Copies, which shews (as learned Hottinger observes) some various or different reading between that Copy and ours, but none ever doubted that it was out of the Hebrew. Then he questions the antiquity of it; "He knows not when, where, nor by whom it was made." If he will be ignonorant of these things, who can help it? Otherwise he might have learned of those that have

spent more time in the search of these things than himself; that the constant opinion and tradition of the Eastern Churches is, that it was either made in the age the Apostles lived in, or not long after. I mean that which they call the *simple Edition*, (which is by us followed,) which alone were enough to prove the antiquity of it, as Bootius (as great an assertor of the Hebrew Text, as our Adversary can be,) Vindic. c. xix. p. 183, proves, when he saith, "it were intolerable boldness, and no less foolish, not to give credit to them in this business, than if any Syrian or Persian, who never had been in Europe, and were altogether ignorant of the Latin," (as he supposes them to be of the Syriac tongue who question the antiquity of this Translation,) "and had never seen or read any Latin book, should question whether the Vulgar Latin Translation of the New Testament, of which he had never heard but by report, were of that antiquity which they of the Latin Church ascribe unto it, and by constant tradition have always done, and should affirm it was made many ages after. And their rashness," as he there adds, "is so much the more detestable, because we have most strong arguments to prove the great antiquity of it, as that it must needs be in the third century at least, because Diodorus Tarsensis, Theodorus Mopsuestes, Polychronius, Procopius, Gazæus, and others,

who lived some of them in the fourth century, do often mention and commend a Greek Translation then in use, which was made out of the Syriac." He saith further, "That there can be no place for doubting in this matter, because the Syrians have many Fathers of their own nation, some since, others long before Diodorus, who wrote in their own Syriac language, and quote many places out of the Syriac Translation of the Old Testament, made out of the Hebrew, which agree verbatim with that which we have, of which he is most certain, by those many instances which he could give out of that great Syriac MS. called *Catena Syriaca in Evangelia*, which he had among many other Syriac books, out of the Library of that famous and reverend Usher."

VI. The great antiquity of this Version is also proved *Proleg.* xiii. out of the ancient writers which mention it, Saint Basil, Saint Chrysostom, Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine, Eusebius, and others mentioned in the ancient Greek Scholiast, besides Jacobus Syrus, (who was present at the Nicene Council,) and Ephraim Magnus, who do both mention this Syriac Translation, and commented upon it in Syriac. Besides it must needs be of great antiquity, when that other and later Syriac Translation was made out of the LXX. above a thousand years ago, as appears by Masius in Jos. who had some Syriac books of that

Translation written before that time; and some Syriac Copies of the New Testament are now remaining in the Duke of Florence's Library, (as I had from one residing there, who perused the same MSS.) which appear to have been written above a thousand years ago; of which with other arguments, those that please may read *Prolegomena* xiii. The Adversary further tells us, "That in many places it evidently followed another corrupt Translation, and that it passed through the hands of men ignorant and suspicious, against whose frauds and folly, by reason of the paucity of Copies, we have no relief." But for proof of all we have not a word, nor any testimony, nor any instance of any Translation it followed at all, much less of any corruption; but all this you must take upon his word, against the judgment of all learned men, who have some of them spent more years in this Translation, than he ever spent days, and therefore what credit his bare *ipse dixit* may have, let any wise man judge.

VII. Lastly, having nothing to say against this Translation in particular, he falls upon the scribe of [M] that Cambridge MS. which we compared with the rest, for desiring the prayers of the Saints for him, and that God would hear them on his behalf; as if the credit of an ancient Translation depended upon any addition made by a transcriber, who lived, it may be, a thousand

years after: by which reason he might reject the Greek Text of the New Testament, because in some old MSS. some such prayers and ejaculations may be found added by the scribes of those Copies.

VIII. Thirdly, he falls foul upon the [N]Samaritan Pentateuch and Version, p. 327, and 260. He labours first to prove what nobody denies, "That their Pentateuch cannot vie with the Hebrew Text," p. 329, when as he could not but read, *Proleg.* xi.. that it is there expressly affirmed, that their Pentateuch is not authentic, and that there are some wilful corruptions in it, as that about Mount Gerizim; and that it cannot stand in competition with the Hebrew. Then he proceeds and tells us, "that all is uncertain about them and their Pentateuch; that it were no hard task to manifest the uncertainty of what is fixed upon the Original of this Pentateuch in the *Prolegom.* or to enforce those conjectures which he opposeth; but it is not in his present work, nor that he knows of ever will be." In the mean time I hope what is said in the *Prolegomena* may stand firm, till it be impugned or confuted, which I do not fear to be done by our Author in haste. Yet though I do not love to spend time about frivolous exceptions; some things there be which I cannot well pass by without notice.

IX. Pag. 261. he saith, "The Samaritans had not the Book of the Law from the Priest that was sent unto them by the King of Babylon, because they continued in their idolatry, and therefore probably they had it when they were conquered by Hircanus, after their Temple was destroyed, which had stood two hundred years;" and p. 262, 327, 329. "that there are any of them at this day, or have been these thousand years last, is unknown; that they continued in their idolatry till Hircanus's time, who subdued them; that their Pentateuch was not used by any ancient Christians," &c. All which Paradoxes are visible untruths, affirmed without any the least proof, yea, against all history, ancient and modern, and against the judgment of all learned men who have written of this subject. *That the Priest taught them to fear the Lord*, is expressed, 2 King. xvii. 28. How this could be done without the Book of the Law, is not imaginable, when as it is said, that before that time, *they feared not the Lord*, and then it is said, *that they feared the Lord*, though withal *they worshipped their idols*. That Manasseh, the High Priest's brother, fled thither in Esdras's time, and built a temple on Mount Gerizim, whither divers Priests and other Jews also came, and there worshipped God, and offered sacrifices, (though in a schismatical way,) is out of doubt. And how this could be done with-

out the Book of the Law is not to be conceived. That they continued in their idolatry till their Temple was destroyed by Hircanus, is against all ancient records, which affirm the contrary, Joseph. lib. 9. cap. ult. saith, "Postquam Legem, et Dei colendi rationem ab iis, (sacerdotibus à Salmanasare, *for so it should be printed*, missis) edocti diligenter Deum colere cœperunt, moxque cessavit pestilentia, permanentq; in ea religione." Epiph. Hæres. 3. saith, "Illos accepta lege hoc unum studuisse, ut idolorum repudiata superstitione Summum Deum agnoscerent." The same is affirmed by some rabbins, produced *Prolegom.* xi. though out of their innate hatred they forge many calumnies and untruths against them. But that after their temple was destroyed by Hircanus, that they should then, and not before, receive the Pentateuch, is such a groundless fancy, that I could hardly think our Author hoped that any would believe it. Can any man imagine, that for two hundred years they should offer sacrifices, and observe the Law, without any Copy of the Law; and after their temple was destroyed, when they had no place to worship in, that they should then receive it, and that in a strange character, and only the Pentateuch? when as if Hircanus had forced the Pentateuch upon them, he would, without doubt, have forced all the rest of the Jewish Canon upon them, and that in the Jews' charac-

ter. Pardon me, good reader, if thy patience be exercised in confuting such wild fictions, whose very naming is enough to confute them among sober and discreet men.

X. Of the same stamp is that which follows: "That it is unknown that any of them are remaining at this day, or have been these thousand years: that their Pentateuch was never used by ancient Christians, &c." They were not so few in the times of Zeno and Justinian, but that they durst rebel against those potent Emperors. Benjamin in his Itinerary, written about five hundred years ago, found divers Synagogues of them at Damascus, Ascalon, Cæsarea, Palestina, Sichem, &c. Peter du Valle, and others, who lately travelled in the East, have found divers Synagogues of them still remaining at Sichem, Jerusalem, Gaza, Cairo, and Damascus; and affirm, that there are some relicks of them still remaining at Cairo, of those Colonies which Ptolemy carried into Egypt. That their chief Priest resides still at Sichem, on Mount Gerizim, where he sends circular letters to the rest about their solemn feasts. Scaliger had (from Eleazar their High Priest at Sichem, and the Samaritans at Cairo, to whom he wrote,) a Type of the Calendar and Compute for the year 1589, which he published both in Samaritan and Hebrew characters, lib. 7. De Emend. See Gassendus in Vita Peirescii,

p. 157. and Hottinger, Bibliothec. Orient. c. 4. p. 305. I have seen a Samaritan Pentateuch which [O] belonged to one of their Priests at Damascus, about four hundred years ago, as appears by what he hath written in that Copy. And notwithstanding all this, we must believe there are none of them remaining, nor known for these thousand years!

XI. That *no ancient Christians made use of their Pentateuch*, is like the rest. The Author had read the contrary proved, *Prolegom.* xi. where sect. 7. 14, &c. he could not but find Origen, Eusebius, Africanus, Cyril of Alexand. Diodorus Tars. Jerom, Eulogius, Procopius, Epiphanius, the Greek Scholiast, and other ancient Writers quoted, and their testimonies produced, to prove the Samaritan Copy they used to have been the same with this now extant, by the places they alleged about Chronology, and other controverted Texts: yet all these men must not be reckoned among ancient Christians, for no ancient Christians made use of it! It is strange, if any thing can be strange, in such an Adversary, that he should so boldly affirm such things, which are so easily detected, and so plainly confuted. He also saith, that there is no more in Scaliger or Morinus discovered about the Samaritans, than we had formerly from the Scriptures and Josephus; which no man that hath read Scaliger or

Morinus will believe. Those that have read them, or the *Prolegomena*, will find many things concerning the Samaritans and their Pentateuch, which could not be found either in the Scripture or Josephus, being matters of fact, done long after Josephus's time, and after the Canon of the Scripture was finished.

XII. But he is much offended, p. 331. "that from the occasional mention of the Samaritan Liturgy, and the pretended antiquity of it, the Author of the *Prolegomena* falls, and not without some bitterness, on those that have [P] laid aside the English Liturgy, or Service Book, and saith, it had not been imprudently done, to reserve a triumph over the Sectaries to some more considerable victory than any is to be hoped from the example of the Samaritans, a wicked people, forsaken of God, &c. and therefore he could have wished he had refrained that close of his Discourse." And the Author of the *Prolegomena* could have wished that his Adversary could at length learn to relate things truly, and to forbear calumnies. Let the place be looked on, *Proleg.* xi. sect. 23. and let any man see, whether it be not the example of the Jews, who used set forms of public prayer, from the time of Esdras, and who were certainly the people of God, to whom the promises were made, from whom the argument is drawn against our modern Sectaries, and that the Samaritans

are mentioned in this only *ut Judæorum æmuli;* so that the example of the Samaritans proves chiefly the practice of the Jews, whose apes they were in this and other things, and so may well be brought as an argument against our Novellists. The words are these: *Quam (Liturgiam Samaritanorum) valdè antiquam esse et prope Esdræ tempora in usu fuisse, vel ex ipsis Judæorum formulis, quas paulo post reditum à Babylone, ab Esdra, et sociis ejus compositas fuisse affirmant uno ore omnes Judæi, quasque in hunc usque diem usurpant, colligi potest. Videantur Cappellus in Spicileg. et Seldeni Notæ in Eut. Unde Sectariorum nostrorum pervicacia, et impietas, meritò redarguitur, qui, spretis omnibus publicis Orationum et Liturgiarum formulis, per omnes Christi Ecclesias ab ipsis Ecclesiæ Christianæ primordiis, et Apostolorum temporibus usitatis, Liturgiam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, omnium per orbem Christianum purissimam, et sanctissimam, damnarunt, et omnibus, &c. Quorum praxis ab ipsis Judæis eorumque æmulis Samaritanis erroris et novitatis arguitur:* where we see the argument is drawn chiefly from the Jews; and from the Samaritans, only as imitating the Jews. And let the Samaritans be what they will, yet their example in imitation of the Jews, who were then the only visible Church of Christ, is a strong argu-

ment for the use of public set forms of Liturgy, and will more prevail with sober and pious men, than all the pretences of factious Novellists.

XIII. In the fourth place, the [Q] Chaldee Paraphrase comes under censure, "which is likewise a Cento made up of divers pieces; some part supposed," *(I say, proved in the Prolegomena,)* "to be written before Christ, and some part" *(acknowledged likewise in the Prolegomena)* "to be written five hundred years after Christ." The great use of this Paraphrase, among other things, is largely shewed, *Proleg.* xii. sect. 17, 18, 19. in confirming the integrity of the Hebrew text, proving sundry main articles of the Christian faith against the Jews, explaining many obscure places, and dark phrases, &c. and our Adversary cannot but acknowledge it: other things likewise concerning these Paraphrases, their Authors, Antiquity, &c. are largely handled in the same *Prolegomena*, to which I must refer the reader. He tells us of the *bulky collections of Various Readings in this Paraphrase*; but he might have observed by the Title, that there are not only Various Readings, but also Observations, which take up the greatest part of that collection. And as for Buxtorf's *Babylonia*, which he talks of by hearsay, it is true, his son sent it me to be printed among other things in this Bible, with a short Preface of his own; but it came too late, after

our own notes on that subject were begun, and would have risen to a greater bulk than the last volume of the Bible would well bear. Whereupon I forbore to print it, but shall willingly communicate it to any that shall undertake to make it public, and shall further their endeavours therein, it being a book very useful, as I conceive, to restore that ancient Translation to its purity, (though I conceive there is much done already in our last volume to that purpose.) And I think that learned author would never have taken such pains therein, if he had so slightly esteemed it, as our Adversary doth.

XIV. The [R] Vulgar Latin scapes the lash pretty well, which I thought should have felt his displeasure most, because so magnified by the Church of Rome. He esteems it the best in the whole collection, except the Interlineary, notwithstanding its corruption and barbarisms. What esteem it deserves, is declared, *Prolegom.* x. sect. 12, but what he writes in preferring it before the rest, is, I doubt, not so much out of his esteem of the Vulgar Latin, but thereby to depress the worth of the rest, which the vulgar reader must needs think to be very bad, when this, which vulgar divines so cry out against, is preferred before them all. He may enjoy his opinion, but he must leave others to judge of them as they see cause, who look upon them

without prejudice. What the authority, and use of this Translation is with the several questions concerning the same, the reader may find declared and debated at large, *Proleg.* x.

XV. Now comes the [S] Septuagint, which he saith, must bear the weight of all; the most of the rest being taken out of it. Of this Translation we have written at large, *Prolegom.* ix. which for its antiquity, and hoary hairs, is most opposed by all Novellists, though it be proved, in the same *Prolegomena*, that it was publicly read in the Synagogues for near three hundred years before Christ; that our Saviour and the Apostles used it, and cited it more frequently than the Hebrew Text, and thereby consecrated it to posterity; that by this Translation chiefly, (which was by the Apostles left to the Church of Christ,) the Church, especially among the Gentiles, was first gathered, and by it nourished and built up, and the world subdued to Christ; that for many centuries no other Translation but this, and such as were made out of it, (excepting the Syriac,) was used in the Church, nor is any other used in the Greek Church to this day; that this was that which the Greek and Latin Fathers expounded, illustrated, out of which they instructed the people, confuted heresies, and maintained the truth; that this, which we now have, is the same for substance with that anciently used, (though in

some things, by the injury of time, and frequent transcriptions vitiated;) which, with all the several questions and controversies about this Translation, are at large discussed and handled; to which I must refer the reader, where he shall find all the doubts and questions raised by this Author, or others, resolved, and all their aspersions cast upon it wiped off. It would be too long to go over the particulars here. Those that amongst our Neoterics have been least favourable to it, have yet highly valued it, as is shewed out of Scaliger, Heinsius, and others. Heinsius saith of it: "Rarum et incomparabilem thesaurum esse neminem ignorare posse, nisi qui ab omni eruditione alienus sit." Aristarch. cap. xv. p. 951. The quarrels and cavils therefore of our Author against it, I shall not meddle with now; all of them, and a great deal more, is related and answered in the same *Prolegom.* ix. only I cannot but observe how he overlashes still, when he affirms, that most of the Versions in the *Biblia Polyglotta* are evidently taken out of it, which he cannot with any colour affirm of any but the Arabic; of which, yet, himself formerly told us, the Pentateuch was translated out of the Hebrew, and some part out of the Syriac: as for the rest, viz. the Samaritan Version, the Syriac, Chaldee, and the Vulgar Latin, they are all out of the Hebrew, except the Psalms in the Vulgar Latin and

Ethiopic, which seem to be out of the LXX. Though it may be here and there in some words they may agree with the LXX. yet this gives not the least colour to affirm that they were taken out of it.

XVI. Besides, we may observe upon what weak grounds he goes, when he sticks not to insist upon that Argument against the Septuagint, that the Original Copy was burnt in the Library of Alexandria, in Cæsar's time, to prove that there are no true Copies now left; which childish argument he knew was answered, *Proleg.* ix. sect. 49. so as might have made any man of common discretion forbear to urge it: for it is shewed, and on all hands confessed, that there were thousands of Copies every where extant among the Jews, and read publicly in their Synagogues all the world over, and so had been for some hundred of years before the burning of Ptolomy's Library; so that the loss of that Original Copy (though it may be justly doubted whether it perished in that conflagration or no, as is there shewed,) can no more prove that succeeding ages have not the true Copy of it, than it can be inferred that we have no true Copies of the Hebrew and Greek Texts because the first Originals have been lost many ages since, as among other things is there shewed.

XVII. The Ethiopic and Persian Transla-

tions, which he falls upon in the last place, "are the worst and most corrupt in the world. He can find no use of the Persian, but only to shew that there is such an useless thing in the world. The Ethiopic is the novel endeavour of an illiterate person. He knows not whether some of them be in use now in the world, he is sure that it were well that they be not; had he not seen them, he could not have imagined any had been so bad. He thinks some Jews had a hand in one for money." Thus some men shoot their bolts at random. It is sufficient that learned men, and such as are able to judge, do acknowledge the use of them, and thankfully receive the publishing of them. The antiquity and use of both, especially of the [T] Ethiopic, is declared *Proleg.* xiv. and xv. What is there said and proved, will, I doubt not, overbalance what is by him barely affirmed to the contrary. That the Ethiopic is now used, and hath been since the conversion of that Nation, among the Abyssinians, through those large territories, consisting of many kingdoms, is shewed by good authority, and sundry reasons, against Scaliger. Our Author knows not whether it be any where used, but I think there is scarce any besides himself that doubts it, that doth not shut his eyes against the clear light. Concerning the [U] Persian, it is acknowledged in the *Prolegomena* not to be that ancient Trans-

lation mentioned by Theodoret and others of the ancients, of which it may be doubted whether any part of it be extant: as also that it was made out of the Syriac, not immediately out of the Greek; yet that it may be useful, is likewise shewed, *Proleg.* xv. in divers particulars, and that this Copy we have printed was written three hundred years ago; but how long before the Translation itself was made, we cannot determine. How the Jews should have a hand in any of the Translations is a fancy which I think never lodged in any man's breast but his own, nor can he shew any ground for it. It may as well be said, that Turks and Mahometans made all these Translations for the use of Christians. Because the transcriber of the Ethiopic, (as it is rendered in Latin,) makes Saint John Bishop of Constantinople, (though it be doubtful whether it may be so rendered, as he might have seen in the annotations, and the Ethiopic word is not Constantinople, though the learned translator of it into Latin conjectured it might be there meant;) therefore the Ethiopic translator must be illiterate, and the Translation novel, when as in the Syriac our Author could distinguish between the scribe and the translator, and not impute the error of the one to the other! And as for the antiquity, it is one thing to say, another thing to prove: let him answer the reasons in the *Prole-*

gomena, or bring better of his own, and we shall believe him; otherwise his bare authority will not be sufficient to command assent against reason.

XVIII. By this which we have said it appears, that as our Author hath feigned to himself an adversary when he had none, that so he might have some pretence of depressing the several Translations; so that which is said by him, we might well have passed by, but that our silence would have been by him interpreted as an acknowledgment of the truth of his affirmations. And although his invectives be groundless and vain, yet I have good ground to believe, that there is something else in the Translations themselves, (which he is not willing to mention,) which hath caused all this bitterness against them. It appears by these ancient Translations that, what our Sectaries have [W.] cried down in the Church of England, as Popish innovations, viz, episcopal government, set forms of Liturgies, observation of festivals besides the Lord's Day, were used (as they are still) in those Eastern Churches, planted by the Apostles, and their Successors, in Asia and Africa, from the first times of their conversion; so that what these men would exterminate as Romish and Antichristian novelties have been anciently used by those famous and flourishing Churches, which never pro-

fessed subjection to the See of Rome. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ:* This is that *cordolium* of our Novellists, the practice of the universal Church of Christ all the world over, which condemns their innovations; which argument is of more force with considering men, than all the acute arguments drawn only from strength of reason. For to condemn the practice of the Church of Christ in all parts of the world, constantly observed in all ages, is *insolentissima insania*, as Saint Augustine long since [said.] These things, with some other ancient rites, appear in the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, &c. which I doubt were as great motes in our Author's eye, which made him so willing to quarrel with the Translations, and to cavil without a cause: and thus I have briefly run over his invective against the Translations, entreating the reader for more full satisfaction to consult the *Prolegomena* themselves, and by *these specimina which we have given of his candour and love of truth, to judge of the rest of his Discourse.* And thus we have done with the main charge, the principal subject of his book, *the Various Readings, and the Corruptions of the Originals which he would thereupon infer.* I shall proceed now more briefly to that other principal charge, concerning the punctuation of the Hebrew Text; after which

we shall add something about the ancient Hebrew Characters, and of the use of the Septuagint Translation, towards the knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue; and so put an end to the reader's trouble and our own for the present.

CHAPTER X.

I. *The Controversy of the Hebrew punctuation, by whom handled.* II. *The charge against the Prolegomena.* III. *No new thing delivered in the Prolegomena about points, nor any thing prejudicial to the certainty and authority of the Hebrew Text.* IV. V. *That the Hebrews always had vowels* אוי *proved. The vowels excluded from the letters by late Grammarians against reason.* VI. *The Masorites did not point the Text as they pleased, but according to the true and common reading. The true reading depends not upon their authority.* VII. VIII. *A main objection answered: That they might certainly point the Text after the language ceased to be vulgar.* IX. *The certain reading of the Text by diligent practice and use attainable without points, proved by example.* X. *In words unpointed, dubious in themselves, the ambiguity is taken away as they are part of a sentence, and by custom or use, proved by the Talmuds and rabbinical writers. The New Testament at first had no accents or notes of distinction, &c. The Chaldee Paraphrase, Syriac, Arabic, had no points at first.* XI. *What is affirmed in the Biblia Polyglotta about this Controversy.* XII. *The first occasion of this Controversy about points handled.* XIII. XIV. *Elias Lev. not the first broacher of the novelty of points.* XV. XVI. XVII. *Divers, both Jews and Christians, held the same opinion long before Elias.* XVIII. *Elias's pretended aim.* XIX. *The seeming advantage given to Papists, no ground to maintain an untruth.*

I. Concerning the Points whereby the Hebrew vowels and accents are now signified and distin-

guished, whether they be coeve with the language itself, or of the same antiquity and original with the Text, either affixed by Moses, as some say, or by Ezra, and the great Synagogue, as others; or whether they were invented by some rabbins after those times to facilitate the reading, and prevent the errors which might arise from the ambiguity of some words, hath been [X] long disputed by divers; by Elias Levita chiefly, among the Jews; among Protestants also, and Romanists; and amongst the former by Jos. Scaliger, Drusius, Sixtin Amama, D. Prideaux, Lect. 12, and others, but most largely by Buxtorf, both father and son; and by Lud. Cappellus; by the father, in his Hebrew Grammar; and by Cappellus, in his *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, printed by Erpenius, at Leyden, in 1614; and by Buxtorf the son, in his answer to Cappellus. The chief arguments on both sides are collected, and with addition of some others, presented, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 38. to 56. What is charged in the *Considerations* upon the *Prolegomena* in this matter, we have in part set forth, chap. iii. in some particulars, and opposite thereto, what is asserted in the *Prolegomena*. We shall now more fully discuss what is charged or objected in the one, and what is granted or denied in the other; not that I intend to handle the Controversy at large, which would be *actum*

agere, and make this short reply swell into a great volume, but as our Author saith, he would, ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ, briefly consider the heads of things, so I shall briefly take notice of *his Considerations.*

II. In his Epist. page 19, he saith, "That the solemn espousal of the opinion of the novelty of the Hebrew punctuation in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, was one chief occasion of *these Considerations.*" The opinion which he opposes, is by him in several places declared, p. 157, "That the Hebrew points or vowels, and accents, are a novel invention of some Judaical rabbins, about five or six hundred years after the giving out of the Gospel:" and p. 205, "That the points or vowels, and accents, are a late invention of the Tiberian Masorites, long after sundry Translations were extant in the world. Their arbitrary invention:" p. 208, c. iv. in the contents, and p. 217, 218, 293, "the arbitrary inventions of some Jews, and that it is lawful for us to change them at pleasure," p. 250, 258, 217, 218. Hence he deduces these consequences, p. 157, "That the agreement of those Translations, before the supposed invention of the points, with the Original, cannot by just consequence be tried by the present Text, as now pointed and accented." And, "that the whole credit of our reading and interpretation of the Scripture, as

far as regulated by the present punctuation, depends solely on the faithfulness and skill of those Jews, whose invention this is asserted to be. This is one of those two principles, which being granted, there is no other way to be delivered from utter uncertainty in and about all sacred truth." Epist. p. 25. "That all things are hereby made doubtful in Scripture, so that no certain truth can be learned from the Scriptures," p. 211: "yea, they not only make doubtful the authority of the Scriptures, but wholly pluck it up by the roots," p. 213. "And therefore he had rather that this work of the *Biblia Polyglotta*, and all works of the like kind, were out of the world, than that this one opinion should be received with the consequences that unavoidably attend it." Those consequences are, Epist. p. 9, "We must either turn Papists or Atheists:" p. 19, "He dare not mention the desperate consequences that attend this imagination:" p. 161, "Either the pretended infallible Judge, or the depth of Atheism, will be found to lie at the door of these Considerations, &c."

III. One would think by these passages, that the *Prolegomena* had delivered some strange and dangerous opinion, never heard of before, which overthrows all certainty, and by consequence all authority of Scripture; whereas it is there proved,

and shall now be made appear, that the same doctrine of the original of points was delivered by the greatest Reformers, the most eminent Protestant divines, both at the beginning of the Reformation, and since; and the best skilled in Eastern learning, which then were, or at this day are, in the Christian world; and the greatest patrons of the integrity of the Hebrew Text: And that, as the same is by the *Prolegomena* maintained, there is no prejudice at all arising to the certainty of the Hebrew Text. For we neither affirm that the vowels and accents were invented by the Masorites, but that the Hebrew tongue did always consist of vowels and consonants; Aleph, Vau, and Jod, were the vowels before the points were invented, as they were also in the Syriac, Arabic, and other Eastern tongues: nor that these points, which are now used for vowels and accents, were the arbitrary invention of the Masorites, but that they pointed the Text according to the true and received reading, and not as they pleased: nor that it is lawful for any to reject their reading at pleasure, but that all are tied to it, unless some error, or better reading, can be clearly proved; nor that the authority of the reading depends upon the Masorites, but that they pointed it according to the received reading, which expressed the true sense of the Holy Ghost; so that the Controversy is only about the present

points, in regard of their forms, not of their force and signification, which D. Prideaux well expresses. sect. 12. Lect. 4. "Controversia non est de vocalium sono, sed signis, an ista fuerint ab initio qualia nunc habemus;" and sect. 3. "De sonis, sive rebus substractis, lis non est, sed de figuris et characteribus," &c. In which it is true, the Author of the *Prolegomena* denies the antiquity or divine original of the present points; wherein, as I said, he hath the concurrent judgment of the learnedest Protestant divines, and ablest linguists; and maintains that they were long after the time of Esdras, yea, about five hundred years after Christ: yet herein he writes with that moderation, that he leaves every man liberty to judge as he pleaseth, only propounds what seemed to him most probable.

IV. First then, for the true stating of the Controversy, which our Author wholly neglects, we must distinguish between the vowels and accents, in regard of their sound and signification, and the points and figures whereby they are now signified or expressed: for it is frequently acknowledged in the *Prolegomena*, that the Hebrew, as all other Languages, consists of consonants and vowels; and that it hath its accents or tones, though not always noted by points in every word as they are now. Thus Drusius, *De rectâ lectione Linguæ sanctæ*, cap. 4. distinguishes:

"Vocalium soni literis coevi sunt, figuræ vero posteriores, et post Hieronymi ætatem." So doth Chamier, *Panstrat.* lib. 12. cap. 4. n. 5. where he writes, "Vocales quoad sonos semper fuisse, de picturis verò se nolle cum ullo contendere, nam posse concedi codices antiquitùs non fuisse punctatos:" so also D. Prideaux in the place now alleged, Lect. 12. sect. 3. vowels do, as it were, animate all words, and are as the soul to the body, whereupon they are called *vocales, à voce;* because by the help of vowels articulate words are pronounced. This is largely proved, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 49, &c. where it is also shewed that the ancient Hebrew vowels were the same before the invention of points, which are in all other Eastern Tongues, as the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, &c. *viz.* אהוי which are yet commonly called *matres lectionis*, because they direct the reading in books not pointed, to which some add ה, and St. Jerome ע. The Grammarians indeed make them all consonants, and exclude the vowels out of the number of letters, that they may make way for the points, but against all reason and common sense: For the Hebrews have as many letters as other nations, (for as is shewed, [Y] *Prolegom.* ii. other nations, as the Assyrians, Greeks, &c. received their letters originally from them, as by their names and order of the Alphabet appears;) and therefore I see no reason why the Hebrews could

not express all their words by these twenty-two letters, as well as other nations. Certainly, the Hebrew Alphabet must be very defective, if it have no vowels, which are the chief letters, without which, no letters can be pronounced: This would make an Alphabet of such letters as could not at all be pronounced, which were most absurd: for as Morinus saith, "quod est sua natura vocalissimum, et per quod cætera reddantur vocalia, esset mutum." By the help of these letters Origen expressed all the Hebrew Text in Greek letters in his Hexapla: The like hath St. Jerom and divers others of the ancients done, when they express some words or verses in Greek or Latin letters. And why could not Moses and the Prophets do the like, as the Jews do at this day, when they express the words of other nations, Latin, Italian, Spanish, &c. in Hebrew letters without points?

V. Out of Origen we have some relicks left in [Z] that ancient Greek MS. of Cardinal Barberini's of the Minor Prophets; which, collated with the Roman LXX. I have printed in the *Appendix*; and have produced some verses, viz. Hos. iii. 2. and xi. 1. in *Proleg.* iii. sect. 49. as a specimen how Origen expressed the Hebrew Text in Greek letters, by which it appears that *Jod* served for (ο) sometimes for (ι) *Aleph* for (α) *Vau* for (υ) and (ϝ) and sometimes for (ε) *Ain* for (α) and

sometimes for (ι). Josephus l. 6. *De Bello Jud.* calls the letters of the name יהוה φωνήεντα τέσσαρα, *four vowels*; for by φωνήεντα he understands *vowels* in opposition to *consonants*, called σύμφωνα. So St. Jerom frequently, as is observed by Gerard Vossius, *De Arte Gram.* l. 1. c. 27. and others. "Verum est quidem hodie vocales in iis quiescere, at olim pro vocalibus fuisse testatur Hieron. qui eas vocales appellat." Epist. 145. "Docet pro *Hosianna* dici *Hosanna*, media vocali illisa, quia ab *Aleph* excluditur *Jod*." Here it is evident he reckons *Aleph* and *Jod* among vowels. And Epist. ad Evagr. "Referre negat utrum dicamus *Salim*," (which is written שלים with *Jod*,) "an *Salem*," which is written שלם without *Jod*, "et hanc causam reddit, quòd vocalibus in medio literis rarò utuntur Judæi." Here it is plain he calls *Jod* a vowel. "Idem tradit Heb. Gen. 13. dicit אפרון cum ו scribi, et אפרן ablata ו litera, quæ apud Hebræos pro (u) legitur." More to this purpose is alleged in the same place, to which I know not what can be answered; it being as clear as if it were written by a beam of the sun, that Jerom reckoned אוי for *vowels*. So *Zuinglius* (misprinted *Zuinger* in the *Proleg.*) *Præf. in Esaiam, Vocalibus nunquam caruit illa lingua.* א *enim a* י *e* ו *i* ו *o et u, nunquam eis defuerunt*, &c. *Beza de recta ling. Græc. pronunc. Non dubito quin ante puncta vocalia*

ab Hebræis Grammaticis divinissimo certè invento excogitata, (quod post Hieron. ætatem contigit,) Aleph idem prorsus illis atque cæteris gentibus sonuerit. This, and a great deal more, those that please may read in those *Proleg.* all which our Author well knew, but was pleased to pass over in silence, as knowing it would overthrow one part of the foundation, whereupon that fabulous opinion of the antiquity of points is built; and therefore for information of the reader I have here transcribed. In the same place the reason is given, why the Hebrews more frequently omit the vowels in the midst of words, than in the beginning or end: *Unde hæc consuetudo Hebræis, vocales in mediis vocibus omittendi plerumque, cum initio et fine sæpius* (not *semper*, as it is misprinted) *adhibeant;* which the reader may find, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 50. Notwithstanding all this, (which our Author had read in the *Prolegomena,*) he sticks not to bring the same words, (which we have mentioned out of Jerom,) to prove that pointed vowels were known to Jerom, Epist. 126. *Nec refert utrum Salem an Salim nominetur, cum vocalibus in medio literis perrarò utantur Hebræi.* Whence he observes, p. 285. "that the Hebrews had the use of vowels, or else he cannot understand his words; for if they did it *perrarò*, they did it sometimes." He did not, or rather he would not, understand

his words; for he could not but know, that by vowels, Jerom meant not the modern points, but the ancient vowels then in use. I would gladly know of him how *Salim* and *Salem* are written in Hebrew, whether *Salim* be not with *Jod*, and *Salem* without it: and then whether in that place Jerom could mean any thing but *Jod* by *vocalis media*. For the vowels which the Hebrews used in St. Jerom's time, they used *perraro*, very seldom, in the middle of words, and most frequently in the beginning and end. And so it is true, they used those *vocales literæ*, which were the *matres lectionis*; but the *puncta vocalia*, the vowels now used in our Bibles, are used more frequently in the middle, seldom in the end, and never in the beginning of a word, no nor a syllable; for, *consona semper syllabam inchoat*. Therefore not the *puncta vocalia*, but the *literæ vocales*, were the only vowels in St. Jerom's time. And consequently our *Considerator* by his own confession cannot understand St. Jerom's words. Besides if our present points had been then in use, there had been then no place left for different pronunciation, either *pro voluntate lectorum*, or *pro varietate regionum*, as Jerom affirms of those vowels he meant in the same place.

VI. It is also to be noted, which is often in the *Proleg.* asserted, that when we say the Masorites were the authors of the points, that they

affixed them not *pro arbitrio*, as they pleased, or made what reading they thought fit, but that they pointed them generally according to the true and accustomed reading, which they had received, as the true sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost, from their ancestors continued from Moses and the Prophets; I say generally: for as appears in the precedent section, in the words cited out of Origen's Hexapla, which also may appear out of the LXX., Jerom, and others that were before the Masorites, they pronounced some letters and vowels otherwise than the Masorites have now pointed them: See Hier. ad Evagr. transcribing Gen. xiv. 18, 19, 20. into Latin letters, where we may find some of them differing from the present pronunciation. The letters *Begadchephat* were not pronounced according to our present rules, as is clearly proved out of Jerom and the LXX. in the *Proleg.* Yet though the sound and pronunciation did sometimes differ, the signification of the words, and the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost might be the same, as in those places out of Origen and Jerom. Or if the sense be differing, yet there want not rules to try which is the best reading, mentioned *Proleg.* vi. However, the pointing was not arbitrary, nor doth the true reading depend upon the Masorites. For as it is said, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 51. *Notandum Masorethas, dum puncta invenerunt, non novos vocalium so-*

nos, vel pronunciationem novam induxisse, sed juxta consuetudinem sibi traditam libros sacros punctasse, ideoque lectionem non ab iis pendere licèt ipsi apices excogitarint, nec ideò lectionem esse veram quia est à Masorethis sed quia verum Sp. S. sensum exprimit, quemque scriptoribus sacris dictavit et per eos literis consignavit. Non enim punctarunt codices pro arbitrio; sed secundum veram et receptam lectionem, quam diligenter poterant, puncta apposuere, &c. And this our Author himself grants, p. 250. where he saith that Elias Levita, who makes the Tiberian Masorites the authors of the points, ties all as strictly to the reading by points, as if they had been by Ezra, and left it not to be altered at every man's pleasure. All which is said in the *Proleg.* which deny that the Masorites at pleasure pointed the Text, and, which necessarily follows, that it is lawful for any whatsoever to alter the reading at pleasure; which as it proves the charge of our Author to be groundless, so takes away his main arguments against the novelty of the points, viz. That the reading would depend upon the authority of the rabbins, and that it would be altogether uncertain, and so the authority of the Scriptures would be taken away. For both these are altogether vain and groundless, supposing that the Masorites did not point the words *pro arbitrio*, but were tied to the common received reading

which they expressed by their punctuation; for the Text was generally so read by the Christian Church as it now is, as appears both by the Hebrew Copies among them, and by the Comments and Expositions and Translations of the ancient Writers of the Church. The reading and expositions therefore of Christians are not regulated by the Masorites, or depend upon their skill and diligence in punctuation; for if their punctuation had never been, the reading had been the same it is: Nor do they rely upon the Masorites, but upon the Text itself, and the true reading of it continued and preserved in the Church of Christ; which because the Masorites had well expressed by their points, the Christian Church received their punctuation, not upon their authority, but as I said, because it expressed the true sense received in the Church of God: and withal, because they saw it conduced much to the more easy reading of the Text.

VII. Against this we have a main objection, p. 292, 293. "That while the Hebrew language was the vulgar tongue of that nation, and was spoken by every one uniformly every where, it had been possible upon a supposition that there were no points, that men without infallible guidance and direction might affix notes and figures which might with some exactness answer the common pronunciation of that language, and so conse-

quently exhibit the true and proper sense and meaning of the words themselves. But when there had been an interruption of 1000 years in the vulgar use of that language, and being preserved only pure in one book, to suppose that the true and exact pronunciation of every letter, tittle, and syllable, was preserved alive by oral tradition, not written any where, nor commonly spoken, is to build castles in the air." After, he saith, "that the relief is insufficient, to say the Masorites affixed not the present punctuation arbitrarily, but according to the tradition they had received. What weight is to be laid upon such a tradition for near 1000 years, (above, according to Morinus,) is easy to be imagined. Nor let men please themselves with the pretended facility of learning the Hebrew language without points and accents, and not only the language, but the true and proper reading and distinction of the Bible; let the points and accents be wholly removed, and the restraint and distinction of the words as now pointed, and then turn in the drove of the learned Critics of this age upon the noted consonants, and we shall quickly see what woful work, yea havock of the sacred truth will be made among them; were they shut up in several cells, I should hardly expect that harmony and agreement among them, which is fabulously reported to have been among the LXX. in the like case."

VIII. To this we answer. 1. That though the Language ceased to be vulgar for 1000 years, yet there was still a succession of Priests and Scribes and other learned men, who continued the knowledge of the language, and the true reading and pronunciation of the Text, and do to this day; with whom the language was the same at it was when the common people spoke it; and their study and profession was to write out copies of the Law, and likewise to read and expound it, or to teach the reading and true pronunciation of it to others, which they did successively from age to age, (as we see in the Greek and Latin, which have for a long time ceased to be vulgar; and yet the knowledge of the tongues, and the true reading and pronunciation is the same among learned men, as it was when they were vulgar.) This was a great part of the Jewish learning, the true reading of the Text; and they, who were most accurate and exact therein, were honoured most among them, and had their schools and their scholars, and their disciples, whom they instructed from time to time, till at length in regard of their many dispersions and banishments, that the true reading might not be lost with the language, they began to affix points to the Text, as well to facilitate the reading, as to preserve it the better from any alteration or change. And therefore it was all one to them, who still preserved the true read-

ing and sense of the Scriptures, to point and accent it as it was, whilst the common people spake and understood it as well as they; and therefore upon this concession, that whilst the language was vulgar the points and accents might have been affixed with certainty, it follows undeniably, that even in the time of the Tiberian Masorites, the rabbins and learned men among the Jews might point the Bible as well as their predecessors might have done whilst the language was common. This is a clear truth to any common understanding, and not to build castles in the air. 2. The true reading was not continued by oral or unwritten tradition after the tongue ceased to be vulgar, but by the written Text, which was always preserved entire among them; and the reading depended not upon tradition otherwise than the reading of all books in other languages, which depends upon the oral instruction of masters and teachers; without which, continued from hand to hand, how could any know that such a letter or character stands for such a sound, or that such a word hath such a signification? The Samaritan Pentateuch, Chaldean Paraphrase of the Pentateuch and Prophets, and the Syriac Translation of the Bible, continued above a thousand years before they were pointed; (and the Samaritan is not yet pointed, as is certainly known and confessed by all;) which shews plainly how the

Hebrew Text might be continued, and the true reading preserved, without pointing; unless our Author can shew any difference as to this matter between the languages: For they have the same letters, the same vowels, *Aleph, Vau, Jod,* with the Hebrew; and the reading in every respect subject to as much ambiguity and uncertainty as is pretended to be in the Hebrew unpointed. And that the true reading might be preserved above a thousand years is not against all reason, but very reasonable to suppose; since we see the same done in the Samaritan, Syriac, and Chaldee, for a longer time, and the same may be said of the Arabic, though not for so long a time after the Alcoran was written.

IX. 3. The certain reading of the Text by diligent practice and use may be attained without points, though with more difficulty than if it were pointed, as hath been heretofore shewed by Martinius, Cappellus, and others. One that is wholly ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, having some Translations, as the LXX. or Vulgar Latin, may by labour and industry, and comparing the Translation with the Text, and observing the antecedents and consequents, find out the signification of each word by itself, and the proper sense and meaning in connexion with others; and may by degrees find out where the translator varied from the Text, and where he was mis-

taken. Thus, among others, Clenard learned the Arabic without any master or instructor, when that language was scarce known in Europe, by the Nebiense Psalter, where the Arabic is without any pointed vowels, by comparing it with other Translations in that Psalter. And so Erpenius, the great restorer of the Arabic in these parts, professes of himself, that, *proprio Marte*, he [A] first got the knowledge of the Arabic tongue, without any teacher, out of Arabic books not pointed; such as the Arabic Gospel, printed at Rome, the Nebiense Psalter, Avicen, and other authors; and if this were done in the Arabic, I know no reason why it may not be done in the Hebrew. In the Chaldee and Syriac, (which seem to be dialects of the Hebrew,) the same was done before points for them were devised. Elias Levita, Galatinus, Scaliger, and others testify of their knowledge, that children are taught to read Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, Turkish, and Persian books, without points; and that they have seen them read very readily. It is true, it is more difficult to read without points, but yet attainable; for our Author is much mistaken when he says, that men may please themselves with a pretended facility of reading the Hebrew without points, I know none that thinks it so very easy: Nay, it is freely acknowledged that it was with more difficulty attained before the points were

devised, and thereupon the faculty of true and distinct reading was accounted no ordinary matter among the rabbins, who counted it a great part of their learning. Yet the analogy of Grammar being agreed upon, and known, it is not difficult for one that is but reasonably skilled in the language, (especially with the help of a Translation, or the like,) to read without points. Now the analogy of Grammar was always the same, or else not only the figures of the points, but the sounds also, are of a late invention. And therefore I doubt not but that if points and accents were taken away, yet by the help of some Translations, and by diligent care and study, one might as well attain to the true reading of the Hebrew, as Clenard and Erpenius did of the Arabic: And that if divers did follow the same study upon the same Text, their harmony and agreement would demonstrate the possibility, and would be better in both the reading and sense of the Scriptures, than is to be found among some congregations at this day, whose harmony in expounding the Scripture, is little better than that of the builders of Babel, when their tongues were divided.

X. Thirdly, it is to be observed, that although the reading of divers words unpointed, considered by themselves, might be dubious and subject to diverse readings, yet this ambiguity is taken away

by the antecedents and consequents; so that in the context, as they are parts of a sentence, the reading which is in itself ambiguous, is determined to one sense and meaning. This is shewed at large in *Proleg.* xiii. sect. 50, 51, where an instance is given, sect. 51, out of Exod. xviii. 15, where the words unpointed are ambiguous, and capable of diverse senses taken severally: but in the context all ambiguity is taken away; and this is proved against Morinus and other Romanists, with whom our Author seems to join hands; who from the ambiguity of some words unpointed would prove the Text to be ambiguous. He instances in דבר, which unpointed is capable of eight significations, which is fully answered, *Proleg.* vii. sect. 24. But if, notwithstanding the antecedents and consequents, some words do still remain doubtful, as it is in the Greek, and in all languages, yet the use and custom received in the Church takes away all further ambiguity. The most of those, that stand for the antiquity of the points, ascribe the first beginning of them to Esdras; as Buxtorf, and others. Now if the Text might be read certainly, and without ambiguity, though without points, from the time of Moses to Esdras, why might it not likewise be continued and preserved as well after Esdras's time as it was before? Experience, as I have said, shews it in other tongues, as the Chaldee,

Syriac, Arabic, &c. which had no points at first, yet were read without ambiguity. The Talmuds, and other rabbinical writings, are daily read both by Jews and Christians without points. Punctuation facilitates the reading. He that understands not the Hebrew, may read it with points; he that is exercised in the tongue may read it without them. There is no colour why the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriac Bible, the Alcoran, might be read, and the true sense certainly known before they were pointed; and why the Hebrew Text cannot, but must be subject to such uncertainty. The New Testament was not at first written with accents, notes of aspiration, distinction, by comma and colon, &c, as is shewed, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 45, and appears by ancient MSS. our Alexandrian, and others; and is granted generally. Whereupon, in the Complutense Edition, it is printed without accents, that it might better represent the αὐτόγραφοι of the Apostles and Evangelists, as the Authors of that Edition in one of their Prefaces affirm. And it is known, that some Greek words, unaccented, are doubtful, and capable of divers senses; and that the distinctions do sometimes alter the sense, and yet none of the ancients accuse the Greek Text of ambiguity, but the reading was certain, and so continued, till accents and distinctions were invented. If the want of these did not

hinder the certainty of the New Testament, why should the want of the points hinder the certainty of the Old? Therefore D. Prideaux, *Lect.* xii. sect. 17, saith, "Lectionis certitudo comparari potest absque punctis ex attenta praxi, et librata orationis serie." To the same purpose Martinius, *Technolog.* "Incerta, inquis, erunt omnia in libris sacris si desunt puncta. Deum immortalem! quid audio? Tota Hebræorum sapientia in scriptis Talmudicis, et Rabbinicis, quæ multa sunt, sine punctis tradita est, sine punctis legitur, et publicè in Scholis exponitur; neque quisquam est qui incerta illic omnia conqueratur; et tu mihi reclamas Hebræa scripta sine punctis incerta esse, neque te protinus ab ipsa rerum experientia convinci refellique sentias!" To these I will only add what Buxtorf senior saith of the uncertainty of the Chaldee unpointed, which may be as truly said and applied to the Hebrew unpointed, *Thesaur. Gram.* 1609, p. 614. "Incerta in voce per se extra sententiam posita non in continuata et perfecta sententia, &c. Arbitrarium est; sed ei, qui ignorantiæ tenebris obductus, nigrum arbitratur esse album, et pro arbitrio de coloribus judicat. Non cujuscunque arbitrium, sed conveniens sententiæ ratio, sed certa constansque analogia Grammatica veram lectionem moderatur." These things considered, most of our Adversary's reasons, espe-

cially that which is the principal, about the uncertainty of the Text are answered; all which are at large handled in the *Prolegom.* iii. but these he prudently passeth over, because if they had been mentioned by him, the whole fabric of his building had fallen to the ground.

XI. That which we affirm there about this controversy, is, first, that the modern points were not either from Adam, or affixed by Moses or the Prophets that were before the Captivity. Nor, secondly, after the Captivity, devised either by Ezra, or any other before the completing of the Talmud. Thirdly, but, after five hundred years after Christ, invented by some learned Jews for the help of those who were ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, whom they would teach, by this means, to read the Hebrew Text as distinctly and exactly as themselves; that so, after they had taken out of the people's hands, and laid aside the Greek Translation of the LXX., they might have every where in their Synagogues men, though unlearned, who by this help might be able to read the Text publicly, which, before the invention of those points, could be done only by a few learned men. Fourthly, as for other matters, though probably affirmed, I do not insist much; as who they were; how many; one or more; in what place they lived; (whether at Tiberias, or elsewhere;) or where they met about

this work; what the precise and exact time was, when the punctuation was made; whether the sixth, seventh, or eighth age after Christ: in which things, because of the great defect of any certain historical monuments among the Jews for those times, all being involved in great obscurity and darkness, by reason of their dispersions and banishments, it is hard to determine any thing with certainty; though it be most probable, that this work was taken in hand, about five hundred years after Christ, by the Tiberian Masorites.

XII. These things being premised about the state of the controversy, and the certainty of the Scriptures without points, it will be needful further to add something concerning the first occasion of this controversy, which is briefly shewed, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 38, to be this: That though the controversy be in itself grammatical, or philological, yet it had its rise from a question theological. For when, at the beginning of the Reformation, divers questions arose about the Scripture and the Church; the Romanists observing that the punctuation of the Hebrew Text was an invention of the Masorites, they thereupon inferred, that the Text without the points might be taken in divers senses, and that none was tied to the reading of the rabbins; and therefore concluded, that the Scripture is ambiguous, and

doubtful, without the interpretation and testimony of the Church; so that all must fly to the authority of the Church, and depend upon her for the true sense and meaning of the Scripture. On the other side, some Protestants, fearing that some advantage might be given to the Romanist by this concession, and not considering how the certainty of the Scripture might be well maintained, though the Text were pointed, instead of denying the consequence, which they might well have done, thought fit rather to deny the assumption, and to maintain, that the points were of divine original; whereby they involved themselves in extreme labyrinths, engaging themselves in defence of that which might be easily proved to be false; and thereby wronged the cause which they seemed to defend. Others, therefore, of more learning and judgment, knowing that this position of the divine original of the points could not be made good, and that the truth needed not the patronage of an untruth, would not engage themselves therein; but granted it to be true, that the points were invented by the rabbins; yet denied the consequence, maintaining, notwithstanding, that the reading and sense of the Text might be certain without punctuation, and that therefore the Scripture did not at all depend upon the authority of the Church. And of this judgment were the chief Protestant divines, and greatest

linguists that then were, or have been since, in the Christian world; such as I named before: Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, Musculus, Brentius, Pellican, Oecolampadius, Mercer, Piscator, P. Fagius, Drusius, Schindler, Martinius, Scaliger, De Dieu, Casaubon, Erpenius, Sixt. Amama, Jac. and Ludov. Cappellus, Grotius, &c. And among ourselves, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Prideaux, Mr. Meade, Mr. Selden, and innumerable others, whom I forbear to name; who conceived it would nothing disadvantage the cause, to yield that proposition, for that they could still make it good, that the Scripture was in itself a sufficient and certain rule for faith and life, not depending upon any human authority to support it.

XIII. Amongst those who undertook to assert the divine original of the points, the chief was Buxtorf, the father; a man without doubt of very great skill in the Hebrew, as any in his time, and one whose labours conduced much to the knowledge of that tongue. This man in his *Hebrew Grammar, edit.* 1. brought divers arguments to prove his opinion: and said more for it than any others had done before him, whose authority, grounded upon his great skill in the Hebrew, drew divers, who wanted either leisure or ability to weigh all the reasons on both sides, to embrace his opinion, and to take it for granted; and the

rather, because it seemed to make more against the Romanists than the other. Afterwards, in the ensuing editions of his Grammar, this Tract about the points was left out; whereupon it was conceived by divers, that he had changed his judgment. And it appears, that divers men of great learning did much oppose his opinion, as Scaliger, Epist. 243. and others; so that it might well be thought he began to stagger in it, and therefore thought fit to forbear the further publishing of it, till he had better considered of the whole matter. After this, Lud. Cappellus, Hebrew Professor at Saumur, a man of great learning and worth, as his writings speak him, published his *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, which was set out by Erpenius at Leyden, in 1624. Wherein he largely handles the whole controversy, answered all Buxtorf's arguments to the full, and brought such convincing reasons to the contrary, that few who read this book without prejudice, but subscribed to his opinion; as Erpenius, Ger. Vossius, Rivet, Sixt. Amama, Spanhemius, Festus Hommius, Cotterius, &c. as appears by some of their Epistles, printed in his *Defensio Criticæ*. Yea, divers that formerly were strongly against his opinion, being convinced by evidence in his reasons, joined with them; as Mr. Eyres, late Prebendary of Ely, a man of great skill in this kind of learning; Ar-

nold Bootius, a man of great knowledge in the Hebrew, and a violent opposer of Cappellus's Critica. Yea, it was conceived by some, that Buxtorf himself was wavering in his opinion, but that he was loth to retract what he had formerly in print affirmed. After his decease, his son, D. Buxtorf, who succeeded his father in the place of Hebrew Professor at Brasil, out of piety to his father, as is by himself in his Vindic. ingenuously confessed, undertook to answer Cappellus, (who had formerly opposed and confuted his opinion about the ancient Hebrew letters,) though not without more sharpness and animosity than could have been wished to have been between Divines, and those both Protestants; which he hath done in a full volume, wherein what he hath performed, I leave to every man's judgment. For my own part, (though he be my worthy and much honoured friend, with whom I have for divers years had friendly intercourse by Letters, notwithstanding our difference of judgment in this and other matters,) yet I cannot assent to his opinion; nor do I find upon perusal of his book, that he hath clearly answered Cappellus's arguments, but that they stand firm and unshaken; nor brought any argument for his opinion, which is not answered by Cappellus; though I believe he hath said as much out of his Hebrew learning, (wherein I think he hath not many fellows

this day living,) as possibly might be alleged. I know that there are [B] some learned men of good note, who partly drawn by Buxtorf's authority, and partly out of fear, lest the Romanists should take advantage by this concession, and partly by their too much adhering to rabbinical tenets, and partly because they never seriously studied the controversy, nor weighed the arguments of both sides in the even balance of an unbiassed judgment, but taking things upon trust without examining the grounds, as the generality of men do in all kinds of learning, have followed Buxtorf's opinion. Yet upon inquiry, it will be found that the most of those of greatest judgment, both in Divinity and Eastern Learning, which this age hath produced, are of contrary opinion. And I must profess, that having occasion, by reason of *this Work of the Bible*, to be acquainted or to keep correspondence with those that are most eminent in this learning, both at home and abroad, I scarce know of any (a few excepted) who are versed more than ordinary in these matters that are not of the same judgment, which I have asserted in the *Prolegomena*.

XIV. This is the true history of the rise and original of this controversy; which though it be mentioned in the *Prolegomena*, yet our Author takes no notice of, but tells another story of it, which we shall briefly consider. He tells us,

p. 248. and Epist. p. 15, 16. "That Elias Levita, the most learned of the Jews of that age, was acquainted with many of the first Reformers, and lived particularly with P. Fagius; that in his Masora Hammat. he broached an opinion not much heard of before, at least not at all received among the Jews, nor for aught that yet appears once mentioned by Christians before, namely that the points or vowels, and accents, were invented by some critical Jews or Masorites living at Tiberias about five or six hundred years after Christ; and that no doubt the man's aim was to reduce the world of Christians to a dependance upon the ancient rabbins for the whole sense of Scripture. *Hinc prima mali labes:* Here lies the first breach in this matter. This fraud being not discovered, and this opinion being broached and confirmed by the great and almost only master of that language, of that age; some even of the first Reformers embraced this fancy. Perhaps Zuinglius had spoken to it before. After a while the poison of this error beginning to operate, the Papists waiting at the mouth of the Reformers, like the servants of Benhadad on Ahab, to catch at every word that might fall from them to their advantage, began to make use of it, &c."

XV. In this discourse, as there are some things true, viz. That Elias was one of the most learned Jews of his age; that he was acquainted with

Fagius; that he maintained the Tiberian Masorites to have been the authors of the points, and proved the same by divers arguments; that divers of the first Reformers were of the same opinion with him: so for all the rest, as it wants all probability of truth, so it may be as easily rejected, as it is affirmed.

XVI. For that Elias Levita was the first that held that opinion, and that it was not mentioned before by any Christians for any thing that yet appears, is far from truth; when as there were sundry Christian writers, (some of which he might have read named, *Proleg. 3.* sect. 38.) who lived long before Elias, some 50, some 100, some 300 years before his name was heard of, who held the same opinion of the points, as Elias did; as Angelus Politianus, Joh. Picus Mirandula, that miracle of his time, Lyra, Paulus Burgensis, besides Raimundus, the Author of *Pugio fidei*, who lived about 1200 years after Christ. Politian thus writes of Pic. Mirand. *Miscell.* cap. 14. "Novitiæ sunt istæ notæ, quibus nunc pro vocalibus utuntur Hebræi, ut idem et comperit, et ostendit, Joh. Picus Mirandulanus, unus omnium prorsus ab omni parte beatissimus, in opere singulari et admirando, quo Psalmos à LXX versos, isto notarum præcipuè argumento, docet Hebraicæ veritati respondere." Besides there lived divers in the same time with Elias, who

knew nothing of him, or scarce had heard of him, as Galatinus, Veltwicus, Zuinglius, Pellican, Luther, and after him many learned men, who held the same opinion, not moved by Elias's arguments or authority, but convinced by the evidence of the things, as Calvin, Mercer, Masius, Boderianus, Jos. Scaliger, Casaubon, Ar. Montanus, Drusius, &c. so that this is a vain brag, that no Christian held the same opinion with Elias before his time. Let our Adversary name so many learned men before Elias, or before the Reformation, that held the points to be of divine original. I doubt it would be hard for him to name any Christian writer that did absolutely affirm the same before that time.

XVII. Nor was Elias the only man among the Jews that held this opinion; for besides the tacit acknowledgment of the whole nation, shewed by their practice in their Synagogues, using a Copy of the Law, without points, to represent the αὐτόγραφον of Moses, which was as themselves confess unpointed; and the testimony drawn from the ancient cabbalists, and talmudists, who draw none of their mystical expositions from any of the points or accents, which without doubt they would have done, if they had then been in use, as well as they do from the letters: besides these, some of the chief rabbins before Elias have held the same, as is elsewhere shewed out of Kimchi,

Cozri, Ab. Ezra, Jehuda Chiug, and others, who expressly affirm that the whole punctuation was the work of the Tiberian Masorites, and upon any doubt in punctuation fly to them; and give this reason of their readings, that the Tiberian Masorites did so point and read it.

XVIII. So that Elias broached this opinion, aiming hereby to reduce the world of Christians to a dependence on the ancient rabbins, is a mere winter story without any ground or reason. For Elias held the points to be part of the oral Law, delivered on Mount Sinai, and continued by tradition, till the points were written and affixed to the Text by the Masorites: and therefore our Author observes elsewhere, p. 250. "That Elias tied all as strictly to the reading by points, as if they had been done by Ezra." Elias therefore did not hold the reading and sense of the Scripture, or the matter of the punctuation to depend upon the rabbins, but only the present forms and figures; and how could he imagine to draw Christians to a belief of that which he did not believe himself, or to a dependance upon the rabbins for the whole sense of the Scripture which himself did not hold? And nothing more shews the vanity of this fancy, than that those Christians that held the same opinion with Elias, do utterly deny that they depend upon the rabbins ancient or modern for the sense of the Scripture. Luther

was far from this; who, as our Author cites him within a few lines, writes, that the Jews had corrupted the Bible by their points and distinctions; and Calvin shews, how little he esteemed the authority of the rabbins on Zach. xi. 7. Let him name any place, or one word out of Elias, or any other writer, Jew or Christian, that intimates in the least that he had any such aim, or name one Christian writer, Romanist or Protestant of this opinion, that professed to depend upon the rabbins for the true sense and reading of the Scripture. As groundless is that which follows, that this fraud of Elias was not discovered by the first Reformers, but that they were unawares drawn to embrace his fancy: as though those wise and learned men were such children and ideots, as not to discern the consequence of this opinion; or of such weak judgments, as to be led by the authority of a Jewish rabbin!

XIX. It remains therefore, that the true original of this question was, as I have shewed, the controversy arising in the beginning of the Reformation about the authority and certainty of the Scripture, in reference to the Church. And hence it was that this question about the points was not ventilated before the Reformation, and that so few make any mention of it; because the questions about the Scripture and the Church were not then raised. And that which begun the quar-

rel doth still continue it: some out of fear, lest they should yield any thing disadvantageous to the cause they maintain, holding the points to be of divine original, and among those some embracing that opinion, not because they knew it to be true, but because they conceive it makes more for our cause against the Papists; amongst which I may justly reckon our Adversary; who Epist. p. 18. is offended at Dr. Prideaux, "because, though he took notice of the advantage the Papists make of that opinion of the novelty of points, and of the danger of it, yet, which seems most admirable, himself falls in with them, and maintains the same opinion:" as if we must measure the truth of docrine, not by *evidence* of reason, but by the *advantage* it brings to our cause; or must affirm what we know to be false, because it *makes against the Papists!* Others, therefore, who see how groundless those fears are, and knowing that the truth must not be denied, though some pervert it to a wrong end, grant what they see cannot be denied about the original of the points, yet maintain the same conclusion about the certainty and authority of Scripture, upon better and more solid grounds; and so doth Dr. Prideaux in that Lecture, where he maintains the certainty and authority of the Scripture, and so yields nothing to the Papists, though he grants the points to be the invention of the Masorites.

CHAPTER XI.

I. *The Adversary's candour and ingenuity in reciting the arguments against the antiquity of points, leaving out some of the chief, and perverting the rest.* II. *The first argument passed by, which is from the testimony of the chief Protestant Divines and Linguists of this age*; *Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Pellican, Oecolampadius, Beza, Mercer, P. Fagius, Chamier, Vossius, Drusius, De Dieu, Schindler, Martinius, Scaliger, Grotius, Schickard, Casaubon, Erpenius, Sixt. Amama, Mayer, Boatius, Spanhemius, Rivet, F. Hommius, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Prideaux, Mede, Egrea, &c.* III. *The last argument omitted also in the Considerations from other Eastern Tongues, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, Samaritan, Persian, &c.* IV. *Postellus's testimony.* V. *The argument from the unpointed Copy used in the Synagogues to represent the* αὐτόγραφον *of Moses vindicated.* VI. *This argument drew the Reverend Usher and Bootius to this opinion.* VII. *The argument from the* LXX. *and other ancient Translations perverted by the Adversary.* VIII. *The other arguments briefly recapitulated. Aben Ezra's words vindicated.* IX. *The Adversary's new argument.* X. XI. *Answered.* XII. XIII. *Other new arguments answered.* XIV. *Another argument.* XV. *Answered out of his own words.* XVI. *The Tiberian Masorites denied, and yet acknowledged by the Adversary.*

I. This question concerning the points is handled by our Adversary chiefly, Chap. iv. and v. of the *Considerations*; though also, by the by, in

some other places he hath some passages about the same, wherein I shall not need to handle all the arguments *pro* and *con*, having done that already, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 38, 39, &c.—56, to which I must remit the reader. I shall only reply to what he answers to the arguments in the *Prolegomena*, and briefly examine what he pretends to be added by himself *de nova*, to prove this rabbinical fancy. First, let us see how he infringes the arguments in the *Prolegomena*; wherein, I must needs say, he deals as in the rest of his Discourse *pessima fide*, and is far from that candour and truth which he professes: for he leaves out divers of the chief arguments, to which he could give no colourable answer; and for the rest, he either propounds them by half, leaving out that wherein the force of the argument chiefly consists, or perverts the sense, and spoils them in his rehearsing of them; so that I may say of them, as the poet did of his verses,

"*Quem recitas meus est, O Fidentine, libellus,*
At male dum recitas, incipit esse tuus."

The arguments are mine which he pretends to confute; but, by his relating them, he makes them his own; for, as he delivers them, I own them not. I shall therefore desire the reader to suspend his judgment till he have compared them as they are laid down in the *Considerations*, and as they are delivered in the *Prolegomena*; and

then to judge as he shall see cause. I shall at present mention some arguments which he hath wholly omitted, and then give a taste of his candid dealing in the rest.

II. The first argument, sect. 58, is brought from the testimony of the chiefest and most learned Protestant divines, and linguists, which this age hath known, whose words I cite, and the places where they are to be found: for such men I conceive are fittest to judge of these matters. Now of these he takes no notice at all, but uses a prudent preterition, because he knew their names and authority would spoil his whole design, and wipe off all his imputations of making the Scripture uncertain, or introducing of Popery, Atheism, &c. They are Calvin, in Zach. xi. 7; Luther, ad finem libri Schem Ham; Zuinglius, Præf. in Esaiam; Pellican. Præf. in Pentat.; P. Fagius, (whom our Adversary reckons, and that justly, among the restorers of the Hebrew tongue, and calls one of the patriarchs and fathers of that learning, Epist. p. 15.) Ad Targum, Genesis xlvii. 24; Mercer, the oracle of his times for Hebrew learning, and one of exact judgment too in other learning, (which two, as some observe, seldom meet in one subject,) in Genesis xvi. 13, and xviii. 3, and Job xxvi. 6, and Amos ii. 12, Annot. in Targ. Mal. 2; Beza, Lib. de recta pronunciat. ling. Græc. edit. anno

1587; Piscator, Schol. ad Genesis xv. 8; Chamier. Panstrat. Lib. iv. c. 12, n. 15; Vossius, De Arte Gram. Lib. i. c. 31, et Lib. ii. c. 8; Drusius, Ad loca difficil, Pent. c. 25, et de recta lect. linguæ sanctæ, c. 4, Martinius, Technol. Lud. de Dieu, Gram. Lib. i. c. 7; Schindler, frequently in his Lex. Pentaglot. I will add the words of some. Joseph Scaliger, a man admired by most, Epist. 243, which is to Buxtorf the father, writes thus: "De apicibus vocalibus Hebræorum, tam mihi constat rem novam esse, quam eos falli qui natos unà cum lingua putant, quo nihil stultius dici potuit aut cogitari. Quis enim negat Arabismi puncta recens esse inventum, id est, multis annis post obitum impostoris Mahometis? Hodiè tamen pueri Turcarum, Arabum, Persarum, et omnium denique Mahumedanorum, sine punctis legere discunt. Eodem modo, Samaritani et Judæi sine ullis punctis, in synnagogis, suis ἐν ταῖς διφθέραις legunt, &c." The noble Grotius was no whit inferior to Scaliger in any kind of learning, who writes thus, in Matthew v. 18, "Libros veteres etiam post Esdram sine punctis vocalibus scribi solitos, quod ita perspicuis argumentis à viris harum rerum doctissimis demonstratum est, ut id amplius inficiari non nisi pertinacium sit." Schickard, a man much versed in all Jewish and rabbinical learning, one who was at first a stout defender of the points, (*strenuus*

licèt primò punctorum patronus, for so the words should be, *Prolegom.* iii. sect 50,) yet afterwards, when he was of a riper judgment, speaking of the points and accents, Lib. ii. De jure Regio Hebræorum, p. 41, saith, "Quod nil tale uspiam appareat in antiquis libris Judæorum, et valdè miratur superesse qui vocalium antiquitatem seriò credunt." For he thinks, "non seriò, sed ad ostendendam eruditionem Rabbinicam, vel aciem ingenii, vel contradicendi studio ita scripsisse, &c." We see these learned men do not speak doubtfully in this point, but peremptorily, as if the matter were now so cleared, that there is no further place for contradiction. To these I may add Is. Casaubon, Erpenius, Sixtin Amama, Mayer, Arnold Bootius, a bitter enemy of Cappellus's Critica, Spanhemius, Rivet, Festus Hommius, Cotterius, &c. as appeareth by their Epistles to Cappellus. Amongst ourselves, I could name those of chief account for Eastern learning, now living, public Professors, and others; whose names I forbear, lest the Adversary in his next invective should fall upon them as rudely as he hath done upon the Author of the *Prolegomena*. Yet some I shall not conceal, (who are out of his reach,) the reverend and learned Usher, and Mr. Selden; both whom I have often heard declare themselves for this opinion; D. Prideaux, Lect. xii. in Vesper Comit. 1627, who mentions

also three more sometime of that University, sect. 4, "Qui in istis studiis versatissimi, Rob. Wakefieldus, Jacobus Cappellus, et Sixtus ab Amama; qui tres ultimi (saith he) superiores duas sententias (*de punctorum antiquitate*) summa cum eruditione et acumine conati sunt refellere." I might add others, as Mr. Mede, Mr. Eyres, late Prebendary of Ely, &c. This argument, though inartificial, yet of great weight, our Author touches not; because he would have it believed that the opinion is singular, and maintained by a few, and that "the generality of learned men in these matters are not infected (as he saith) with this leaven!"

III. As he leaves out the first, so he wholly omits the last; and yet he would have you believe, that he propounds and answers all the arguments in the *Prolegomena*, p. 260. Of what weight it is, and whether it admits any answer, let the reader judge. It is laid down, sect. 48. And it is taken from the other Oriental tongues, which have greatest affinity with the Hebrew, as the Arabic, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, &c. none of which at first had points, nor hath the Samaritan any yet. The Alcoran was at first written without points, as is proved by Golius, and others the chief professors of that language. The like is confessed of the Syriac, Chaldee Paraphrase, and is so clear for the Samaritan, that scarce any

but our Author will affirm the contrary. The Persians have scarce got the use of points as yet, though some of late have begun to make rules of punctuation for that language. In all these languages they have the same letters which of old stood for vowels in the Hebrew; nor have they in the Arabic, that copious language, since the invention of points, any more than three, which serve for all vowels, *Phatha*, *Damma*, and *Kesra*, by which, with a few general rules, and use, they read distinctly, and pronounce all the five vowels. By those three letters which answer to *Aleph*, *Jod*, and *Vau*, before any points were used in any of the languages, they could distinctly read and understand their Translations of the Bible, and their other books, and attain the sense without ambiguity and uncertainty. And none ever doubted but that the Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos and Jonathan, written about our Saviour's time; the ancient Translation of the Syriac, written in the first or second century after Christ; as also the Alcoran among the Mahometans; were read at first, as they are now, (though not with so much facility,) and yet it is certain that the points were added to them all after the invention of the Hebrew points; yea, though points be now added to them all, except the Samaritan, yet neither that, nor the Arabic or Syriac, have yet any notes at all of accents;

and yet those, that are skilled in those languages, know where the accent ought to be in every word and syllable, though no note be affixed, as we see in the Latin, and in all other Vulgar Languages, English, Dutch, French, &c. And in the Greek it is further shewed, sect. 45, out of ancient MSS., as also out of Aristotle, St. Jerom, and old inscriptions, that the Greek anciently had no accents. Angel. Politian, Miscel. c. lviii. and lxxx. mentions some verses of the Sibyls, and the Hymns of Callimachus, written without accents. Our Alex. MS. of the LXX.; that New Testament of Beza, in Cambridge Library; that of the Vatican, and other old MSS. are without accents; and the authors of the Complutense Edition give this reason why they printed the New Testament without accents, because the *αὐτόγραφον* was so written. Yet we know how useful accents are to distinguish words of ambiguous sense, which differ only in the accents. From all which we infer, that if the right reading and pronunciation might be attained and preserved in those tongues without any pointed vowels, and is now, though as yet they have no accents, some of them; then the same might be done in the Hebrew, by the help of the same letters, *Aleph, Jod,* and *Vau,* those *matres lectionis.* I could not yet find in any of the patrons of points any satisfactory answer to this argument; and if our Au-

thor could have given any, I suppose he would not have passed it over without answer more than the rest.

IV. He tells us out of Postellus, that in Jerom's time the Samaritans had points, because he saith, "That the Samaritan and Hebrew letters differ only *figuris et apicibus*, Prolog. in lib. Reg." But he might also have read in Postellus, that the Hebrews had no points, though in his dotage, when he was infatuated with rabbinical and cabalistical fancy, and fell into divers fanatical and heretical errors, among other things, he began to make the points to be part of the oral Law delivered on Mount Sinai, and continued by oral tradition: and his proof out of Jerom for the Samaritan points is as much to the purpose as our Author's proof out of the same Jerom for the Hebrew points, because he speaks of vowels, and saith, *vocalibus in medio perrarò utuntur*: when as it is as clear as the sun (as is already shewed) to any that reads Jerom's words, and *is* so proved, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 49, that by the apices he means, *Literarum ductus et summitates*, as when he saith, that ה and ח *apice tantum differunt*, and in the same place by vowels he means *Aleph*, *Vau*, and *Jod*, which he expressly calls vowels, and saith they are not so frequently used in the middle of words, as in the beginning and end.

V. We see what arguments he wholly omits. Let us now see how he deals with the rest; and how faithfully he propounds them I will instance but in one or two: *Considerations*, chap. 5. sect. 5. p. 267. He there propounds the argument urged, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 41. "The constant practice of the Jews in preserving in their Synagogue one Book, which they almost adore, without points, is also alleged to the same purpose; for what do they else hereby, but tacitly acknowledge the points to have a human original?" Thus our Author. Now let us see how it is propounded in the Prolegomena. *Secundò, ex praxi hodiernæ Judæorum in Synagogis ab ultima antiquitate observata idem evincitur, ubi voluminа sacra, quæ populo publicè præleguntur, sine punctis, accentibus, vel versuum distinctionibus exarata sunt, ut secundum morem antiquis temporibus usitatum Mosis ipsum* αὐτόγραφον, *quod in arca servatum erat, adumbrarent*: And after, *Hoc volumen non punctatum volunt ipsum Mosis volumen in arca Dei jussu servatum referre, quod (fatentibus plerisque eorum doctoribus) erat punctis destitutum, imò ponunt quidam eorum Mosis ævo, extra controversiam figuras vocalium et accentuum nondum fuisse, et hac de causa librum illum in Synagogis hodiè sine notis in Mosaici exemplaris memoriam scribi: In hanc rem Rabbinorum testimonia profert D.*

Buxtorf, &c. Imò probat D. Buxtorf ex Ephodæo: et aliis librum legis punctatum apud eos profanum esse, etiamsi punctationem eraserint, et quod liber, in quo versus per duo puncta distinguuntur, profanus est, &c. To this purpose a great deal more may be read in the same place, where also all the evasions and shifts used to avoid the force of that argument are taken away. Now by this we may see, that the main force of the argument lies in this, *not that the Jews use a book in the Synagogue unpointed,* (which is all our Adversary propounds,) *but that they use one special book of the Law unpointed, for this end and purpose; that it may represent the original Copy written by Moses, and laid up in the Ark, which they acknowledge was written without points; and that this book, if it be pointed, is thereby profaned, and not fit for that use.* Let any man of common reason judge, whether the argument be truly related by him; and whether there be not a vast difference between that in the *Prolegomena,* and this which he propounds; and whether it be not a convincing strong argument to prove by the tacit consent of the Jews, and their ancient practice in their Synagogues, that the Text at first was not pointed. Our Author knew it to be so; and therefore the answer he gives, doth not at all touch that wherein the force of the argument lies. Buxtorf is more ingenuous;

for he confesses that this argument proves that the αὐτόγραφον of Moses was without points, but not that the αὐτόγραφον of Ezra was unpointed, which yet in that paragraph is further shewed, and that answer taken away, with all the other evasions which our Author brings out of Buxtorf.

VI. This argument I have heard the reverend and learned Usher affirm, was a great motive to draw him to this opinion. And Arnold Bootius (of whom I have spoken before, that he was a great opposer of Cappellus's Critica, and sometimes a stiff defender of the antiquity of points,) yet confesseth, "that it doth sufficiently prove the novelty of points." Epist. contra Cappell. de Text. Hebr. Auctorit. sect. 46. I should tire myself and the reader, if I should go over the rest of the arguments. I shall only desire the reader, who would be further satisfied, to compare them, as they are in the *Prolegomena*, with our Author's answer; and if he find any one of them either truly related, or fully answered, I will publicly recant what I have said. He shifts off many things with this, *That they are fully answered by Buxtorf;* but those that shall take the pains to look over both, will find that there is not one answer made by Buxtorf which is not taken away in the *Prolegomena*. To go over all now, would be *actum agere*, and would make

this short reply, (as [if] it was intended,) to swell into a great volume.

VII. Yet for a further proof of his candour and love of truth, I shall exercise the reader's patience with one specimen more. An argument, sect. 46. is drawn from the ancient Translations, the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, &c. *Ex quibus perspicuum est ob defectum punctorum voces quasdam ambiguitate laborasse; unde aliter interpretati sunt versionum istarum authores, quam hodiè in punctatis codicibus legimus; cum, si olim punctati fuissent, ambiguitas nulla fuisset; nec aliter legissent illi quàm in hodiernis exemplaribus legimus. Hoc passim observarunt viri docti in Commentariis suis, aliisque scriptis; et multa exempla ex LXX aliisque interpretibus colligunt, ubi eædem literæ (sublatis punctis) tam ipsorum versioni quam lectioni hodiernæ inservire possint.* Of this divers instances are brought. Here we see the argument is, *That divers words without points were ambiguous, and capable of diverse senses, and that the same may be read, as the interpreters render them, if the Copies were not pointed, whereas they are now read in another sense, as the Copies are now pointed, there being no change at all in the letters, but only in the points.* Now how doth our Adversary propound this argument? p. 281. "It is farther pleaded, that the ancient

Translations, the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, do manifest that, at the time of their composing, the points were not invented. And that because it is evident in sundry places that they read otherwise, or the words with other points, (I mean as to the force and sound, not figure of them,) than those now affixed." Thus he propounds it, and then answers with a scoff, "That the differences would as well prove they had other consonants, that is, that in their Copies they used, they had other letters and words than *ours*, as *other vowels*." Who sees not here a plain and wilful falsifying of the argument? for the argument is not drawn from all places where the Translators read otherwise than is now read in the Hebrew Copies, but only from such places where the same word with the same letters (being unpointed) might be read and rendered both as they translated it, and as it signifies according to the present punctuation; or that the word consisting of the same letters being without points was ambiguous, or capable of two significations, of which the one was followed by the translator, the other by the punctuators. Now our Author never mentions that wherein the argument consists, *that the word being unpointed is ambiguous and capable both of the signification given in the Translation, and of that which agrees to the modern punctuation, when as, if it had been pointed, the am-*

biguity had been taken away, and they must have read it as they are now read in the pointed Bibles; but tells us of words read with other points differing from those we have now; and thereupon makes his pleasant inference, that we might as well prove by this, that they had other letters and consonants, as vowels and points! It is true, indeed, if the argument had been such as he makes it, taken from all words wherein they differ from the present pointed Copies; but not when only the words unpointed agree with their rendering it, by reason of the ambiguity without points. Buxtorf confesses, this argument seemed to be invincible, *Achilleum;* but as our Adversary propounds it, it is *stramineum*, and merely *ridiculous;* for it is well known and granted often, that these Translations, especially that of the LXX., differ in many places, where the reason cannot be given from the ambiguity of the word destitute of points, but that it is from other causes, of which we have spoken before.

VIII. I will not insist upon the other arguments, as that from the Samaritans who never had any pointed Copies, nor have to this day, but by the help of these three letters אוי have kept the true reading of their books, by which means they are now also read of others, which is not only said, but proved, though the Adversary answers it with a scoff, *pergula pictoris*. That of the

silence of all the ancients, Jerom, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Josephus, all skilled in Hebrew antiquities, who never mention the name of any point or accent, though they had often occasion to mention them, as is proved by instances in Jerom; to which no answer is given, but a bare denial of what is proved, viz. *that they had no occasion!* The silence of both the Talmuds in all those vast volumes, where there is not one word or tittle of any pointed vowel or accent, (as is acknowledged by Buxtorf himself,) though there was *occasion*, yea a *necessity*, to have mentioned them in some places which are there instanced in, if there had been any then known; to which no answer is given, but a bold general denial *that they had no occasion!* That, before the age of the Tiberian Masorites, there is no mention of any points, by any writer, Jew or Christian, as is largely shewed, and that the antiquity of those books where they are mentioned, as the book *Zohar*, &c. is acknowledged by Buxtorf to be forged, and antedated a thousand years, and so proved by Scaliger and others: that the ancient cabalists draw all their allegories and mysteries from the letters, (as they are called,) not one from the points, which, if they had been known in their times, would have yielded them matter enough, yea more than the letters, for their mystical expositions, as we see in the later

cabalists which have been since the invention of points: (which argument also is quite omitted by the Adversary:) that the Keri and Ketib, which are confessed by all to be for the most part Various Readings gathered out of ancient Hebrew Copies, are all about the letters only, not any about the points, which yet, if the points had then been in use, had been more subject to mistakes of the scribes than the letters, and so more Various Readings might have been gathered out of them than from the difference of the letters: that, in the same Keries and Ketibs, the vowels or points belonging to the marginal word or the Keri, are put under the word in the Text, or the Ketib, to admonish the reader, that the word in the margin must be read, and not the word in the Text: and divers other the like things, which were most absurd to ascribe to the sacred penmen, who, if they had been the Authors of the points, would have put the true reading, (which they could not be ignorant of,) into the Text, with its own proper points, and not have placed it in the margin without points, or have put the points under another word to which they did not belong, with which it cannot be read: Such things (of which divers are observed in the punctuation) are altogether unworthy to be ascribed to the Spirit of God. That the names of the points and accents are all of a late original,

all Chaldee, not any Hebrew; to which nothing is answered, but that the names were invented by the late Grammarians; as if before that time they were without names, or could be continued in public use for above a thousand years without names to distinguish them! That the number and use of them all is uncertain, and not yet agreed upon among the Grammarians, divers of them apparently superfluous; and yet, in this plenty, divers notes are deficient which are used in other languages! These things are largely deduced and handled in the same *Prolegomena*, which I do only here name for brevity's sake; yet I cannot but take notice once more of our Author's sincere dealing in relating our arguments. Aben-Ezra's words, to prove the punctuation by the Tiberian Masorites, are brought, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 4. In his Comment on Exod. xxv. 42. he saith, *that some of the first pointed Copies, pointed by the Tiberian Masorites, were extant in his time. Vidi ego libros, quos examinaverint sapientes Tiberiadis, et de quibus juraverunt quindecim ex senioribus eorum, quòd diligenter considerarent omnem dictionem, omnem punctationem, et unamquamque vocem, plenam et defectivam; Et ecce scriptum erat Jod in dictione* יִרְעֶה *sed non sic inveni in libris Hispaniæ et Galliæ, nec in ultramarinis.* These

words he recites thus, p. 270. "Nothing can be spoken more directly contrary to what is intended, than that which is urged out of Aben-Ezra in Ex. xxv. 42. where he affirms that he saw some books examined in all the letters and the whole punctuation by the wise men of Tiberias, namely, to try whether it were done exactly according to the pattern they had." Here we see he adds that which makes the words seem to contradict that they were brought for; *(namely, whether it were done according to the pattern they had;)* of which words not one is in Aben-Ezra, nor in the *Prolegomena!* For the meaning of Aben-Ezra is plain, that they examined every word, letter, and point, whether all were rightly pointed according to the true and common pronunciation or reading, which our Adversary makes to be, according to some former pointed Copy; which is utterly contrary to Aben-Ezra's meaning and words; and yet they might re-examine their own Copy, after it was finished; as we know it is usual for those that are careful, and exact in writing, to review what they have written, that they may amend such errors and faults as have escaped them before they make it public. If he may be allowed thus to add and detract and change what he pleases, he may easily make any argument worth nothing, and to prove

the contrary to what it is brought. Thus he falsifies the words of Aben-Ezra, and the argument drawn from them in the *Prolegomena.*

IX. Leaving his answers to our argument against the points, let us see what arguments he brings for their divine original. Here he refers us to Buxtorf; and I do likewise refer the Reader to Scaliger, Sixtin Amama, Dr. Prideaux, Vossius, and others; especially to Cappellus's *Punctationis Arcanum;* and also to the *Prolegomena;* where, whether Buxtorf's argument be all answered, let the reader judge. Something more our Author pretends to add, which hath been omitted by others, p. 252, &c. The argument, though somewhat intricate, and obscure, as he propounds it, seems to be this. *That all Grammars must be made after the language, and gathered by observations out of the language, which are reduced to rules of art, and what is anomalous or irregular is excepted from the rest; and that if the points and accents were invented, and added to the Text, being no part of the language, then there must be some general rules of art constituted and made before they could be added to the Text, according to which they were fixed and added; and so there must be some Grammar or art according to which they were contrived and made. Now that this could not be, he proves by two reasons.* 1. *Be-*

cause there are so many words anomalous, irregularly pointed, contrary to the analogy of Grammar, which they might have made all regular to their own great ease, and advantage of the language, facilitating the learning of it. 2. Because the Masorites, who curiously have reckoned up every word in the Scripture, and the irregularity of every letter and tittle, never mention any of those catholic rules, by which they or their masters proceeded in the fixing of these points; nor do any footsteps of that art appear in the Masora, or any learned Jew, which was their rule or canon in affixing the points; but all the Grammarians collect their observations and rules, as they could, by particular instances out of the punctuations already made.

X. This objection, at least in part, was made long since by Buxtorf the elder, and the answer given long ago by Cappellus in his *Arcanum*, l. ii. c. 10, 11. 19, &c. and lately in the *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 54. For the first, about *words anomalous*, he may find, among other things, this answer given: That they were so pointed by the Masorites, *non consilio, sed casu*, by casual mistake, which if they had observed, they would have pointed all regularly; and that in such a long work this might easily happen, that some words might escape their diligence, which the succeed-

ing Masorites, supposing out of reverence to their predecessors, whose diligence and learning they so admired, that no error could befal them, gathered and noted; conceiving that some great mysteries lay hid in these *anomalous punctuations*, like as about some *letters*, as *Mem clausum in medio*, Is. ix. 7. and *Nun medium in fine*, Job xxxviii. 1, (of which, *Prolegom.* iii. and viii. 7.) which were at first, casual mistakes of the scribes, as is thought by the learnedest Protestant divines, observations were made by those that came after; as if they had been purposely so written by the sacred penmen, to signify some great mysteries. Besides, it may be answered, that the former Masorites pointed these words irregularly, according to that reading and pronunciation which they were taught by their Masters, (whose words they accounted as oracles,) though against the analogy of Grammar; and that the following Masorites, finding such anomalous punctuation, left all as they found them, only made observations thereupon. For the Masora, as is proved in the *Prolegomena*, and is confessed by all, was not written all at one time, nor the work of one man, or perfected in one age, but done by several persons, at several times; some distinguishing the verses by two points, which seems to have been the first work; others adding points to signify vowels; others,

accents; others gathering observations out of what was done by those before them.

XI. To the second, there are general Grammar rules in every tongue, and a particular Grammar analogy in each particular tongue, before it be reduced into rules. These, no doubt, were considered by the Masorites in their punctuation; and accordingly they pointed the Text according to such rules for the reading, and pronunciation, as they were taught by their masters; and invented the names and figures of the vowels and accents, which they have left to posterity; though the later Grammarians herein differ from the ancienter about the names, nature, number, and use. The way and manner how it is most like they proceeded, is excellently set down by Cappellus, Arcan. lib. i. c. 17, 18. Some general rules, which may be called grammatical, when they went about this work, they devised and agreed upon; which, by succeeding Grammarians, were perfected and reduced into a body. And though it be generally thought that no Hebrew Grammar was made above five or six hundred years ago, yet Maimon, speaking of divers Grammarians that were before him, mentions R. Saadias, who died about the year of Christ 940, to be the first Grammarian; which was not long after the Masorites had completed their work, as some observe; so that the rules which the Maso-

rites observed or made in their punctuation, are expressed in the Grammars which were made after their punctuation. Besides, if this argument were of any force, it might prove the Chaldee Paraphrase, the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, &c. to have been always pointed, and the points coeve with the languages; which yet is denied by all that are skilful in those languages; for all their books consisted at first only of consonants, as they are called, as well as the Hebrew; and the points were added long after; and Grammars composed after all, and gathered out of pointed Copies. The Chaldee Paraphrase was not at first pointed, as is proved by Buxtorf in his Chaldee and Syriac Grammar; and after it was pointed, no Chaldee Grammar was made by any of a long time. Elias Levita found it so hard a task, that he gave it over after he had begun; and Munster was the first that reduced that tongue into grammatical rules. And if it be said that they pointed the Paraphrase according to the punctuation of Ezra and Daniel, which they suppose to have been always pointed, I deny that those few Chapters could give direction for the punctuation of the Paraphrase, or the whole Chaldee tongue, (of which a small part is expressed in those Chapters.) Neither can this be said of the other tongues, the Arabic, Syriac, &c. of which Grammars were made long after the punctua-

tion; and yet it is granted, that their points were not coeve with the languages. Let our Adversary, therefore, shew how the Grammars of those tongues were made after the punctuation, and so he may answer his own objection about the Hebrew.

XII. He objects further, p. 255, 256, "That if the punctuation had been by the Masorites, they would have falsified and corrupted the Prophecies of Christ; which they might easily have done, by placing the points and accents so as to pervert the sense and coherence of the words, as in Is. liii. where, according to the present punctuation, they make incomparably more for the Christian faith, than any ancient Translations." This is answered before, where it is shewed, that the Masorites did not point the Text, *pro arbitrio*, as they pleased, (as our Author would make us say;) but according to the true and accustomed reading, to which they were tied. This argument is brought in the *Prolegom.* vii. to prove that these Jews did not, *de industria*, corrupt the Hebrew Text; because then they would have corrupted those places concerning Christ, or where the chief mysteries of Christian religion are mentioned, which we see they have not meddled with: but it proves not but that the Masorites might fix the points to the Text, the true reading whereof they could not alter, but

would have been presently discovered by the Christians; nor would they attempt it, the whole nation being so zealous for the letter of the Text, that, as Josephus saith, they would rather die a thousand deaths, than wilfully falsify the least tittle.

XIII. Again, p. 292, he saith, "That though the points might be affixed while the tongue was common and vulgar, yet after it had ceased to be vulgar for a thousand years, to think that points could be then fixed to the Text, and the reading continued so long by tradition, is to build castles in the air, &c." But to this we have already answered at large; and shewed that the knowledge of the tongue, and the true reading continued among the Priests and Scribes after it ceased to be vulgar, who might with as much ease point the Text, (it being the same to them as when it was vulgar,) as they might have done whilst it was commonly spoken by the people; and that it was not continued by oral tradition; for they had the written Text for their ground, as is already declared.

XIV. But there is one argument more which he propounds, and follows at large, p. 225, 226, &c. (for we must find out his reasons, as they are here and there scattered, without any method.) *This he is sorry that others, out of their respect*

to the rabbins have passed by. It is taken from *the consideration of the persons supposed to be the authors of the punctuation, who were men so unfit for so divine and admirable a work, that, of all the fables in the Talmud, he knows none more incredible than this story, viz. That men,* 1. *who were no part of the Church, or people of God, possessors only of the letter, &c.* 2. *Who were remote from the right understanding of the Word of God, desperately engaged against the truth,—enemies to the Gospel.* 3. *Under the special curse and vengeance of God.* 4. *Feeding themselves with vain fables, and mischievous devices against the Gospel, labouring to set up a new religion, under the name of the old.* 5. *Profoundly ignorant in all manner of learning and knowledge.* 6. *Addicted to monstrous figments, yea, for the most part idolaters and magicians, &c. should be the authors of so great and excellent a work, of such unspeakable usefulness,* &c. This argument he spends near twenty pages upon, by a fierce invective against the Jews and rabbins, which he after contracts to these heads, p. 240, 241, &c. And to strengthen this argument, he saith, p. 2, 3. "That the Masorites (the supposed inventors of the points) cannot by any story or other record be made appear, that they ever were in *rerum*

natura, &c." and p. 304. " they came, no man knew whence, and no man knows when and where."

XV. To which argument I answer, first, that concerning the usefulness of the present points, (which is acknowledged,) though I am none of them that are affected with novelties, or delight in changes, yet I am of the opinion of those learned men, who do not conceive the present punctuation to be so excellent and complete a work, but that it might be much bettered, and made more useful; and that there are some things, (especially accents,) which might be omitted, of some of which none can give a full account; and the rest might be reduced to a smaller number, and be made more facile and useful: some other things also might be added which are useful in other languages, and wanting in this, as hath been already shewed by divers learned men. Secondly, that notwithstanding all this which is said against the Jews and rabbins, I shall not need to go further for answer than the objector's own words, after a few pages, when his heat was something allayed, p. 251. "That yet they were men still, who were full able to declare what defect they found to be so, and what they found to be otherwise, and that it cannot be thought reasonable that so many men, living in so many several ages, at such vast distance one from another, who some

of them, it may be, never heard of the names of other some of them, should conspire to cozen themselves, and all the world besides, in a matter of fact, nothing at all to their advantage." I apply it thus: That notwithstanding all that is said against them, yet they were able to declare the reading of the Text, received and continued amongst them; and that it cannot be imagined they should devise any other or new reading, which should be received by all that lived in so many several ages, and at such vast distances, and should conspire together to cozen themselves, and all the world in a matter of fact, tending nothing at all to their advantage. Thus we see the same hand pulling down in one page what it had set up in another. For if they might be meet witnesses for the divine original of points, as he affirms, notwithstanding what is said against them, why might they not also be meet witnesses in testifying and declaring the common and received reading, then in use, and in expressing it by their punctuation?

XVI. I may add, that notwithstanding all that is said of them, they were most zealous, (in their greatest apostasy and infidelity,) about the letter of the law, and the true reading of it, even to superstition, and so continue: they did never *intervene in contice* more than since their rejection by God. And though generally they be men of

no great learning in other matters, yet about the reading of the Law, and right pronouncing of it, and the knowledge of every tittle, they were diligent, even to admiration; and accounted it a great part of their learning, that they could so exactly read the Law, and teach others to read it. Lastly, for the Tiberian Masorites, though it be not much material by whom, or when, the points were fixed, or at what place they lived, so it be granted they were not of divine original, nor known till after the Talmud; yet notwithstanding our Author's declamation, it is most probable that the Tiberian Masorites were the first inventors, and more probable than any thing by him said to the contrary; nay, though he denies that ever there were any such men *in rerum natura*, as we have seen already, p. 243, yet, forgetting what he hath said, and contradicting himself as usual, he tells us, p. 223, "that there was formerly a School of the Jews, and learned men, famous at Tiberias is granted," and, p. 240. "The Tiberian Masorites (the supposed inventors of the points) were men living after the finishing of the last Talmud." And, p. 271. he cites and approves that saying of Azarias, "who ascribes the restoration of the points to their use, after they had been disused, to the Tiberian Masorites." And p. 270. "That by receiving the punctuation from the Tiberians, the continuation of it in that

School, not the invention of it, is intended by Aben-Ezra;" so that it seems, that these Tiberian Masorites, who never were *in rerum natura*, and lived no man knows where, nor when, are found out at last to have a School at Tiberias, and to have continued and restored the punctuation there, though they invented it not!

CHAPTER XII.

I. *The consequences, inferred from the novelty of punctuation, not proved at all, but taken as granted by the Adversary.* II. *His false suppositions.* III. *In stead of reasons, his earnest wishes, of taking the points out of the Bible. The accents, &c. out of the New Testament.* IV. *The consequences, &c. cannot be proved by the Adversary, nor by any Papists, Atheists, &c.* V. *A challenge to them all, to prove their consequences, from the novelty of the punctuation, as stated in the Prolegomena.* VI. *The Adversary proved guilty of the said consequences.*

I. I SHOULD now come to the consequences which our Author would infer from our opinion about the points, viz. *That if they were invented, and fixed to the Text, by the Masorites, then the reading and sense of the Scripture becomes uncertain and arbitrary, and the supreme authority thereof in all matters of faith and life is quite overthrown, and we must depend either upon the fidelity and diligence of the rabbins for the true reading and sense of the Scripture, or fly to an infallible judge, and turn Papists, or else turn plain Atheists, or fanatic Antiscripturists, by rejecting the Scripture altogether.* These are his inferences, p. 147, 161, and Epist. p. 9, and 25. But the invalidity of this argu-

ment is already shewed at large in what we have premised in the foregoing Chapter, as also *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 5. 31. For it is proved that the reading and sense is the same before and after the punctuation, and not any way depending upon the authority of the rabbins, or of the Church, or of an infallible judge. For supposing what we have already proved: 1. That the Hebrew tongue never wanted its vowels, א ה ו י, which were used as vowels before the invention of points, as in other Eastern languages; and that, where they were wanting, the connection of the words, with the antecedents and consequents, together with the continued custom and use, did determine the sense, and make the Text as it is now, and free from ambiguity. 2. That the rabbins did not point the Text, *pro arbitrio*, as they pleased, but according as the true and usual reading continued always among them, and derived from the sacred penman, and that it is not lawful now for any to alter or reject the present reading at pleasure, unless a better reading can be clearly proved, or that some error hath crept in, contrary to the ancient writing;—all these consequences vanish to nothing.

II. Now for proof of these consequences our Author brings nothing, though *affirmanti incumbit probatio*, but takes these things for granted, which the *Prolegomena* do utterly deny, as alto-

gether false and untrue, viz. 1. *That there are no vowels among the Hebrew twenty-two letters, and so that the Hebrew had no vowels before the invention of points.* 2. *That the Masorites did point the Text, as they pleased, and so that the reading according to the present punctuation depends merely upon the skill and fidelity of those rabbins.* 3. *That it is lawful for any to alter the reading at pleasure, and to accept or reject the points, as no part of the Text.* 4. *That it was not possible to continue the true reading and sense of the Text after the language ceased to be vulgar, without the points:* All which are so many mistakes, and not only rejected by the Author of the *Prolegomena*, but by evident arguments proved already to be assertions void of truth; so that these props being taken away, all his building falls to the ground.

III. Now in stead of reasons which are none, our Adversary tells us of his own earnest wishes and endeavours, p. 221. "That he had rather this work of the Bible, and all works of the like kind, were out of the world, than that this our opinion should be received with the consequences which unavoidably attend it;" and p. 244. "that he would labour to the utmost to have the punctuation taken out of the Bible, if it were the invention of the Masorites, nor should he (in its

present station) make use of it any more." Thus do violent men run from one extreme to another: either he must have the punctuation to be of divine authority, or else he must labour to the utmost to have it out of the Bible. But these wishes and violent expressions are no proofs with such as will not swallow his opinions, by a blind implicit faith, as oracles! Our opinion of the points hath been and is already received amongst most of those that excel in this kind of learning, and among the most eminent and judicious Protestant divines, who are best able to judge of things of this nature; nor will it find the less acceptance among learned and judicious men, because of his hot passionate declaiming against it; for heat and passion are but weak proofs of the truth of any opinion; they are like water that bears up the lightest things, and lets the heaviest sink to the bottom; and are indeed no better arguments than that of him in Scaliger, who would prove that by laying a wager which he could not make good by sound reason! If he be so earnest to have the Hebrew points taken away, (supposing they be not of divine original,) why doth he not labour the same for the accents, notes of aspiration, and distinction of sentences in the Greek Text of the New Testament? it being certain that they were not in use when the New Testament was written, as we have proved *Proleg.* iii. sect. 45. and in

the precedent Chapter; and that the Greek Text is subject to ambiguity in diverse places by the absence of the accents and notes of distinction, Whether doth he like it better to have the New Testament printed with accents and distinctions, as it now is, or to have it without any, as it is in the Complutense Bible, which is so printed as I have shewed, that it might the better represent the Original Copies which were written first without accents?

IV. As for the advantage which Papists, Atheists, &c. make of this with his intimation, *As if all were looking towards Rome that hold this opinion,* I shall not need to say more than hath been said already; when from the Various Readings he would have inferred the same consequence on the behalf of Papists, &c. It is enough to shew the vanity of this surmise, that the greatest and learnedest defenders of the Protestant cause, and of the authority of the Original Texts, have been, and are of this judgment. What some Romanists infer upon this principle is nothing, unless it could be proved justly to follow, which neither they nor this author are ever able to do. He might have taken notice that his objection is answered *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 51, where this inference which some of that Church make of the ambiguity of Scripture unpointed, and that instance of Morinus, in the word דבר, which with-

out points may be read eight several ways, and hath so many significations, is taken away. Nor do all those of Rome urge this consequence. There are not wanting among them who maintain, that the Text unpointed is certain, and not ambiguous; as Simeon de Muis, Joh. de Espieres, and others. And although many of them argue against the Scripture in general, as our Author doth, that the Text unpointed is uncertain, and therefore no fit rule of faith and life; yet I do not remember that, in any particular controversy between them and us, they urge any one place of Scripture for their cause, upon the uncertainty of the reading without points; which plainly shews that there is no such uncertainty in the Text unpointed, as is pretended by them and this Author; for they allege all places according to the common reading of the Hebrew, or the Vulgar Latin. Let our Adversary, therefore, name any place in particular, where the ambiguity of the Text without points makes for them or against us, or where they have advantage upon this ground in any particular case controverted; or else this consequence will appear a mere cavil.

V. I do, therefore, appeal to all rational men, and do challenge our Adversary with all the rabble of those he mentions, as joining with him in this inference, all the Papists, Atheists, fanatic persons, &c. in the world, to make good their

consequence of the uncertainty of Scripture from that opinion of the punctuation, as it is declared and limited in the *Prolegomena*, viz. *That if the points were fixed by the Masorites to the Hebrew Text (that is, as the case is stated,) understanding only the forms and figures of the points, not the force and virtue of the vowels and accents themselves, which is acknowledged to have always been; and that they did neither point the Text at pleasure, but according to the true reading commonly received to which they were tied; not that any now may at pleasure reject this reading by the points;*—that upon this proposition thus stated, it doth necessarily follow, *that the Scripture is dubious and uncertain, and cannot be a sure rule for faith and life:* This consequence if they can prove, I will retract my opinion and acknowledge my error: But if our Adversary cannot prove it, I expect he should do the like.

VI. But now as it was observed before about the Various Readings, so here the same may be observed about this question of the points, that the Adversary unawares pleads the cause of them whom he would seem to oppose, and whilst he would make others guilty of promoting Popery, Atheism, &c. himself is most deeply guilty by his own arguments. For he grants the consequence which they urge, to be necessary and true, as

will appear, if it be brought into a Syllogism, which runs thus. *If the points and accents be not of divine original, but affixed by the Masorites to the Text, then the Scripture is uncertain, capable of divers senses, and therefore no fit rule for faith and life, &c. But they were affixed by the Masorites to the Text, and are not of divine original. Ergo!*

The conclusion of the Syllogism we all agree is false and impious, and therefore one or both propositions must of necessity be false. I should deny both, if it could stand with evidence of truth, but granting that which cannot be denied, and which the ablest and learnedest men that the Protestant cause ever had grant to be true, I do with the same persons deny the major or the consequence, and lay the weight of the cause upon it; which all the Papists, Atheists, and *Considerators* in the world, are never able to prove. The Adversary on the other hand, 1. denies the *minor*, which his opposites may with more probability make good, than he can the contrary, they having not only the learned of their own Church, but also the best learned Protestants (as I have said) affirming the same with many strong reasons, which to any man unbiassed will seem more concluding than those brought for the other opinion. And 2. he grants the consequence, yea proves it as well as he can, (which all sober

Christians, and all that have not joined hands with Papists, Atheists, &c. deny,) from which that conclusion inevitably follows ; *that the Scripture is uncertain, and therefore of no authority in matters of faith,* &c. ! Let all men, therefore, judge who it is that pleads the cause of Papists, &c. He who denies the consequence, or he that grants it, and labours to make it good. Thus he is caught in his own net, and unexcusable before God and man, by betraying the cause which he pretends to defend, and by doing that himself of which he unjustly accuses another.

CHAPTER XIII.

I. II. *The charge, that all our knowledge of the Hebrew is derived from the Septuagint.* III. *Answered.* IV. *This, if it were true, makes nothing against the Hebrew Text.* V. *The last charge, that the present Hebrew character was brought in by Esdras, who used the Assyrian, and left the old character to the Samaritans. The authority of the Hebrew Text the same it was, because Esdras did this by Divine authority. The Greek manner of writing changed in the New Testament since the Apostles' times.* VI. *By whom this question hath been handled.* VII. *Buxtorf not absolutely for the present character, though he argues for it.* VIII. *His modesty, and the Adversary's confidence.* IX. *Arguments for the antiquity of the Samaritan character. All that can be brought in a matter of fact, of such antiquity. Testimonies of ancient writers, Eusebius, Saint Jerom, Bede.* X. *Both the Talmuds, diverse rabbins.* XI. *The shekels or ancient coins of the Kings of Israel stampt with Samaritan characters.* XII. *The exceptions of the Adversary.* XIII. *Answered.* XIV. *His fancy about the Samaritan letters confuted.* XV. *The fiction of a twofold character exploded.* XVI. XVII. *His other exceptions answered.* XVIII. *The true character of the Considerations. Advice to the Adversary if he thinks fit to reply.* XIX. *The Conclusion.*

I. We have gone through the chief heads of our Adversary's charge; the Various Readings and the pointing of the Hebrew Text. We shall

with more speed pass over the rest, by which he pretends the worth and esteem of the Hebrew Text is depressed, as the deriving our knowledge of the Hebrew Tongue from the Translation of the LXX. and making the Samaritan Characters to be the old Hebrew letters; of which now we shall speak briefly.

II. For the first p. 206. He saith, "That the Author of the *Proleg.* grants that all our knowledge of the Hebrew is taken from the Translation of the LXX., as he is quoted to that purpose by Morinus, Præf. ad Opusc. Samarit." The same is twice mentioned in his Epistle, p. 10, and 26. which he disproves by the example of Jerom, who had his knowledge of the Hebrew tongue by the help of Hebrews, and by the Tiberian Masorites, who pointed the Text according to the tradition of them that spake the language in its purity, and could not have the knowledge of it from the Seventy.

III. For answer, first, why doth not our Adversary name the place in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, where these words are to be found? or if they be not there any where to be found, (as indeed they are not,) why doth he put these among the heinous crimes with which he charges the *Prolegomena*, affirming elsewhere, p. 1, 52, 160. "that had not these tenets been published with the *Biblia Polyglotta*, thereby to gain authority by

that work, he would not have meddled with them?" Now this, I am sure, is no where in the *Prolegomena*, or in the *Biblia Polyglotta*. And if this be not, why will he upon the words of Morinus, (a petulant Jesuit, as he will make him,) why, I say, will he accuse any upon such a man's testimony as his, whom he calls in his railing rhetoric, "an infamous person, a barking dog," &c. when as he could find no such thing in the *Biblia Polyglotta?* But the truth is, Morinus doth not say, that this opinion of Cappellus is approved in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, (which our Adversary very well knew,) but that "in a dissertation, or preface to an introduction to the reading of the Oriental Tongues, he approves that opinion of Cappellus." Now what is this to the *Biblia Polyglotta?* and yet the Author of the dissertation doth neither in that dissertation, nor any where else, wholly subscribe to Cappellus's opinion, whatsoever Morinus saith, which this Author could not be ignorant of: his words are only these, speaking of the use of the Greek Sept. *Exigua esset absque hac (versione τῶν ὁ) linguæ Hebrææ cognitio.* There is some difference between *nulla*, and *exigua;* the former he never said, for he knows, and frequently affirms, that though the Hebrew ceased to be vulgarly spoken after the return from Babylon, yet there remained always, among the priests and

learned of that nation, the knowledge of the tongue, which they continued and taught to their children and posterity: yet for the knowledge of it among Christians, the greatest part of their knowledge of the Hebrew came by the Greek Translation of the LXX. that being the only Translation of any Hebrew book known among either Christians or Jews; and this was made shortly after it had ceased to be vulgar, and therefore without this *exigua foret*, amongst Christians, the knowledge of the Hebrew had been little: for there is no book extant, written in pure Hebrew, save only the Bible, nor any Translation of it before Christ, save that of the LXX. and therefore, as Clenard and Erpenius attained the Arabic by the Translations out of that tongue in the Nebiense Psalter, and other Arabic books; so I doubt not, but that, out of this Translation, the Hebrew tongue might be learned. And therefore for those that wanted the teaching and instruction of Jewish Masters, their knowledge of the Hebrew would be little, without this Translation. And no question but Origen in his Hexapla, and Jerom in his Translation, made great use of that Translation to this end; though I know very well, that Jerom made use also of divers Jewish rabbins, and amongst others, of some Tiberian doctors of note, as him-

self affirms, who were not long before those Tiberians that pointed the Hebrew Text.

IV. But now what is this, (supposing all were true what he affirms,) to the depressing of the Hebrew Text, or to prove the uncertainty of the Scripture, or that the Text is corrupt? I see not any colour of such a consequence; nor doth our Adversary bring any reason to prove it. It is true, Arnold Bootius, in his furious invective against Cappellus, takes hold of his words, and would prove this to be false; but infers no such thing as this Author doth, as if hereby the Hebrew Text were endangered; which if he could with any colour have made good, I am sure he would not have omitted.

V. We come now to the last of these things which tend to the depression of the esteem of the Hebrew Text; which, among others, is reckoned by our Adversary in the first place, p. 205. viz. "That the present Hebrew character is not that used by God himself, and in the old Church before the captivity of Babylon; but it is the Chaldean, the other being left to the Samaritans." The same is also mentioned, Epist. p. 7. This [C] question is handled at large, *Proleg.* iii. sect. 29—38. I might forbear to speak any thing more thereof, because it makes nothing at all against the Hebrew Text, though we make the present

character to have been the Assyrian, and that the old Hebrew Character was left to the Samaritans; for seeing that we make Esdras and his associates the authors of this change, when they restored and settled the Canon of the Old Testament, and it is confessed by all, that what they did, was by Divine authority; hence it is evident, that the authority of the Hebrew Text suffers nothing by this change of the character, but that it is in this respect the same it was before: no more, nor so much as the change of the Greek character, and of the manner of writing in capital letters, without accents, spirits, or distinctions of words or sentences, as the first Copies of the New Testament were written, (as we have elsewhere shewed, *Prolegom.* iii. sect. 45. and Chap. 11. of this Treatise,) into that form which is now in use, derogates from the Greek Text of the New Testament; because this change was not made by any prophets or men inspired as the other was; and therefore our Author had no colour of reckoning this amongst those things which derogate from the Hebrew Text, but that he was willing to catch at any thing which might seem to impair the esteem of the *Biblia Polyglotta* amongst his English readers, for whose misinformation these *Considerations* were contrived; unless he thinks with some superstitious Jews, that there is some peculiar sanctity in the form or fashion of the charac-

ter. Nevertheless, because he hath thought fit to say something of this argument, though he touch not the tenth part of what is said in the *Prolegomena,* because he would fain seduce the ignorant reader into an opinion, as if great wrong were hereby offered to the Hebrew Text, I shall therefore briefly add something by way of answer.

VI. This question hath been so clearly and fully handled by Scaliger, Drusius, Vossius, Cappellus and others, that I believe there are few that have read and weighed the arguments of both sides, who think the present character to be the old Hebrew letter. It is true, Buxtorf junior wrote a Tract upon this subject, wherein he doth not absolutely defend as a certain truth, that the present character is that which was used at first, though he brings all the arguments he could to this purpose; but only to shew, as he saith, sect. 4. that this opinion is not so absurd, or apparently false, as Scaliger, Drusius, and other great Hebricians would have it; but that it may be probably defended. To this Dissertation of his Cappellus wrote an answer, 1645, (which I conceive began the quarrel between these two learned men, which hath since been continued with too much eagerness about other matters,) wherein all his arguments are answered, and the contrary reasons urged and defended, with that evidence

and clearness that Buxtorf hath not made any reply since that time, that I have seen; though he hath since written against Cappellus upon other subjects; being, it may be, convinced of the error of that opinion, which he thought formerly not improbable; which if it be so, as his ingenuity is to be commended, so the confidence of our Adversary is to be condemned, who is peremptory in a question, which, as it plainly appears, he never seriously considered, not sticking (after his usual manner) to call this opinion a fiction, and a mere fable, though it be in a manner demonstrated, and hath as clear and evident arguments for it, as any thing of this nature is capable of, viz. testimonies both of ancient Jews and Christians, both the Talmuds, and the ocular demonstration of old Jewish coins daily digged up out of the ruins of Jerusalem, and other places, stamped by the Kings of Israel before the Captivity; besides reasons and the authority of most, if not of all the best skilled in Jewish antiquities, and Hebrew learning, of later times; as is shewed at large in the [D] same *Prolegomena*, and appears by the figures of the coins themselves, which are engraven, and printed in the *Apparatus to the Biblia Polyglotta*, in a Tract of the ancient Hebrew coins.

VII. Buxtorf confesseth, sect. 2. "that though both opinions have their patrons, yet the business

is brought to that pass, that the opinion of the novelty of the present character hath gotten far more to assert it, and those of chiefest note for their learning in this kind, who are some of them so peremptory in the cause, that they think those, that dissent, *nec ferendos, nec audiendos esse;* and that the great fame and esteem of their exquisite Hebrew learning, hath drawn the most unto that opinion. He adds withal, sect. 4. "Equidem cum nemine super hac re acrius contendere, aut disceptare mihi est propositum." And sect. 5. confesseth ingenuously, that he dares not hope "se hoc assecuturum, ut omnibus satisfaciat, ultimamque literarum Hebraicarum antiquitatem, ἀναμφισβητήτως probet ac persuadeat, &c." only he hoped to shew that the other opinion was not so absurd, as that the defenders of it ought to be accounted half divines, or half men, or sceptics that doubt of all things, or plain asses, as Scaliger and Drusius had styled them. Yet here is one who is so confident and peremptory, that he dares style that opinion which is generally held by most learned antiquaries, a mere fable and a fiction; hereby verifying that saying, *Qui pauca videt, citò judicat;* and that men, who are rash and heady in their decisions, are seldom free from great errors.

VIII. The arguments of both sides are propounded, *Prolegom.* iii. which I shall not need

to repeat, but shall refer the reader thither for fuller satisfaction; and the rather, because the Adversary brings nothing to the contrary, but his own conjectures, or bare affirmations, without proofs. (What he saith of the Samaritans is already answered in its proper place.) I shall only recapitulate what is largely handled in the *Prolegomena* concerning these characters.

IX. All the arguments that can be brought to prove a matter of fact, especially of such antiquity, can be no other than testimonies, especially of ancient and credible writers, who might best know the truth, the remaining relics and monuments of such characters; with the judgment of such of later times, who have been most versed in things of this nature, and therefore are best able to judge: all which we have here. Among ancient writers, we have the testimony both of Christians and Jews: of Christians, Eusebius, Jerom, and Bede, men best skilled, of any in their times, in Jewish and other antiquities; who affirm it as a thing certainly known, and not to be doubted of, that Esdras changed the old character into that we now use, leaving the other to the Samaritans; whose testimonies, especially Jerom's, is so express, and the thing so frequently affirmed in his works, that they admit no evasion; as appears in the [E] same *Prolegomena*, where all the subterfuges, brought to evade the

force of the words, are plainly confuted and taken away. And when we name these, we name all that among the ancients have said any thing on this subject; nor is there any one ancient writer produced, that hath said any thing to the contrary.

X. To the testimonies of ancient Christians, we have added the testimonies of both the Talmuds, which with the Jews are of sacred and unquestionable authority. The Babylonish Tract. Sanhedr. sect. 2. The Jerusalem Tract. Megil. sect. 1. affirming that the Law was first given, כתב עברי *Scriptura Hebræa,* and afterwards, in the days of Esdras, it was written, אשורית כתב *Scriptura Assyriaca;* as also the testimonies both of ancient and modern rabbins; (who though some of them, especially of the latter, that they may maintain the antiquity of the present character against the Samaritans, feign, among other things, that Moses's αὐτόγραφον was written in the modern character, which they call sacred; and that the rest of the Copies for common use were written in the common character, which is retained by the Samaritans; and that the use of the sacred character was only restored by Esdras, after it had been long disused;) yet all agree in this, that the present Samaritan characters were anciently used among the Jews, and that some Copies were written in them; which testimony of

the Jews against themselves, in a matter which, they think, tends to the disparagement of their character, is an undeniable proof, that only the evidence of truth forced this confession from them.

XI. But above all, that of the shekels, or ancient coins, heretofore, and lately, digged up about Jerusalem, and other adjacent places, stampt on the one side with *Aaron's rod,* and the other with the *pot of Manna,* and the inscription of ירושלם קדשה *Hierusalem sancta* on the one side, and שקל ישראל *Siclus Israelis* on the other, if there were no other argument, were enough to demonstrate to all, that do not wilfully shut their eyes, the truth of our assertion; as is there proved at large. Arias Montanus, and Postellus, having got some of these coins, esteemed them as great treasures and undoubted proofs of the ancient Jewish coins, and also of their weights. That they were coined by the Samaritans, cannot be imagined, because they were never possessed of Jerusalem, nor would have given the title of *Sancta* to that city, which they did abominate; and that they were before the Captivity, Arius Montanus, Postellus, and others collect from the name of Israel; which was the common name of all the Tribes before the defection and carrying away of the Ten Tribes, when they were styled Jews, and not before, from Juda

the chief of the remaining Tribes. To this we shall add one thing more: either the present Hebrew character is borrowed from the Chaldee; or else we must hold that, of the Eastern languages, the Syriac and Arabic have each his distinct proper character, and the Hebrew; but the Chaldee none at all; which how probable it is, let any man judge.

XII. Against this what saith our Adversary? He saith, p. 262. "That all is a groundless tradition, and a mere fable; that Eusebius spake only upon report, and as for Jerom, supposing this to be false, sufficient instances may be given of the like mistakes in him. The testimony of the Talmuds is with him of no weight, unless seconded by very good evidence. To that of the shekels, that we are in the high road of forgeries and fables; in nothing hath the world been more cheated. And if it be granted that the pretended coins be truly ancient, must it needs follow, that because these letters were then known and in use that they only were so, or that the Bible was written with them, and those now in use unknown? Then to salve the credit of the coins, he will answer one conjecture with another. The Samaritan letters are (if he may so say) plainly preternatural, a studied invention in their frame and figure, fit to adorn when extended, or greatened by way of engraving and embossing any

thing that shall be put upon them, or cut in; that we may think they were invented for that purpose, namely to engrave on vessels, and stamp on coins, and so came to be of some use in writing also; and that their stamp and form promises some such thing. All which is the more probable, because Clemens tells us of three sorts of characters among the Egyptians; one for things of common use; another, hierographic, used by the priests in their sacred writings; and the other hieroglyphic, which was also of two sorts, simple, and symbolical: and seeing it was not unusual to have sundry sorts of letters for sundry purposes, it is not improbable, that it was so also among the Jews."

XIII. To all this I might refer the reader to the same *Prolegomena*; where all this, and a great deal more, is fully answered. At present I say, 1. To call that a groundless tradition and a mere fable, which is supported with the testimonies of such grave and learned authors, both ancient and modern, confirmed by both Talmuds, and chief rabbins, and by real monuments, and ocular demonstrations, which, like Memnon's statue, speak aloud for the truth of this assertion, and upon such slight conjectures, as are by the Adversary produced, shew a high degree of rashness. Eusebius not only affirms this change of the character, but also gives one chief reason

why: That the Jews might have nothing common with the Samaritans, whom they hated *cane pejus et angue.* Jerom, he saith, supposing this to be false, might be mistaken: nay, I say, he was certainly mistaken, supposing this to be false; and so, if this ridiculous kind of arguing may be allowed, our Author, supposing all he writes to be false, was mistaken in every thing. But it is not enough to suppose he was mistaken, but to prove it; and to infer that because he was mistaken in some other things, that therefore he was mistaken in this, is the way to decry all human testimony at once. All histories and records are by this means made useless; for if they mistake in some things, they must be believed in nothing; and so our Author, because in his Treatise he mistakes in many things, (as I believe he will not, I am sure he cannot, justly deny,) therefore he must not be believed in any thing! I confess he that willingly affirms untruth in some things, deserves not to be believed in any thing: but that he who mistakes in some things through inadvertency, or involuntary error, must be believed in nothing, is to take away the credit of all histories in matters past, and the ground of all civil society and commerce among men for present and future times. The Talmuds are of highest authority with those against whom we chiefly argue, viz. the modern Jews, and therefore cannot be denied

either by them, or by any that embrace their opinion; nor was their authority ever denied in this point by any that I have read, either Jews or Christians till now; but some kind of answer, though absurd and foolish hath been found out, rather than they would wholly deny their authority. And though the Talmuds be full of fables, yet by his own rule, if that which they affirm be attested by other good evidence, as here it is, in this case their testimony ought to be of weight. But the answer serves for all: *Eusebius, Jerom, the Talmuds, the rabbins are all deceived, their reports fabulous, and the shekels are forged and feigned!* Here is a ready way to answer all arguments of this kind, to deny all authority, and to say, *that all is false and fabulous.* But this is a sign of *a desperate cause* to deny all without shew of reason to the contrary, which is to cut the knot when it cannot be loosed. There are many counterfeit coins, I grant. I have seen some Jewish coins which might easily be discovered to be forged, of which I have spoken in the place above mentioned; but to infer thence that all are forged, and that there is no way to distinguish between those that are true, and those that are counterfeit, is as if one should say, that all the old Roman coins, which are daily found and digged up amongst us, are counterfeit, because some such

have been counterfeited. See *Proleg.* iii. sect. 35.

XIV. But that he may not seem to deny all without some shew of reason, he brings in a conjecture to answer, as he calls it, a conjecture. But 1. the proof from the coins is not a bare conjecture, but as clear a demonstration, as in things of this nature can be had. 2. His conjecture is a groundless fancy, which none could ever have hit on besides himself: he tells us the letters of the sicles are preternatural, which what it means, I believe himself can hardly explain. I never heard before of this distinction of letters, into natural and preternatural: Are there some letters natural? I thought that all characters had been the arbitrary invention of men, not any from the dictate of nature; else there had not been such variety of them in the world: It seems then there is an universal character by nature, and so they might have spared their pains that have studied so much for the inventing of an universal character for the use of all nations. Preternatural characters then must be such as proceed from some error in nature, as monsters are said to be *præter intentionem naturæ*, productions wherein nature fails, and comes short of her end. The Samaritan character then it seems, is some monstrous character, framed besides nature's intention: and if so, why may there not be also some

characters supernatural, used by angels and spirits, notwithstanding what Duretus writes against them, *De linguis totius universi*, and Bangus *De literarum Angelicarum vanitate*, such it may be, as *Liber Enochi*, in Dr. Dee, [F] written by direction of his spirits! Here is new doctrine of letters not heard of before. These Samaritan letters then upon coins are *monstrous letters*; but if they be such, how come they to be a *studied invention, and found out to adorn and emboss vessels and coins?* I had thought that *preternatural issues* had been most deformed and ugly; but here, it seems, *they adorn pots and coins!* But what great ornament is there in these letters upon coins, (for I never saw any upon vessels, nor himself I think,) more than in other letters; or what studied invention is there in them? they seem to me to be the plainest and rudest letters of any, (an argument of their antiquity,) far from any curiosity or studied artifice: many other characters are far more curious, intricate, and difficult, as those may see that shall look over the several Alphabets, printed *Proleg.* ii. and that make as fair a shew. I have seen coins both with these letters before the Captivity, and others stampt with the modern letter since the Captivity; and, in my poor judgment, there is no more adorning in the one, than in the other.

This preternatural character, I doubt, will prove nothing else but the preternatural issue of a misguided fancy, or of one willing to frame and coin any thing, rather than to submit to clear truth!

XV. But yet there might be some other character besides this, with which the Bible might be written: Here he brings in that figment of R. Azarias, of a *twofold character*; one *sacred*, with which the Bible was written; and one *common* for other uses, and in which the Samaritans writ their Pentateuch; which he would confirm by the practice of the Egyptians, that had diverse sorts of characters. Of the Egyptian characters I have spoken at large, *Proleg.* ii. and that device of Azarias taken up by some others, the better to uphold their opinion of the modern letters, is proved to be a groundless conceit, *Proleg.* iii. That among the Heathens they used some secret character which was counted sacred, thereby to hide their profane mysteries from vulgar knowledge, is shewed in the same place; lest if the people should know all, they should contemn and deride them: but that there were any such among the Jews, or people of God, is a thing merely devised to avoid the force of this argument, without any ground either in Scripture, or any ancient writer; nay, against both, and against clear

reason, as is there shewed; to which place I refer the reader, where the vanity of this twofold character is sufficiently proved.

XVI. But here comes in another argument against this change of Esdras, "That the ground, upon which this supposed change was made, shews the thing to be a mere fancy, viz. that the Jews had forgot their old character, during the seventy years' Captivity, and had learned the Chaldean; when as the same men were alive at the burning of the first, and the building of the second Temple; and that the men of the same generation should forget the use of their own letters, is incredible. Besides, they had their Bibles, and that in their own character only; whether they had any other book or no, we know not; and whence this forgetting of the one, and learning of another character should arise, doth not appear. Again, the weight of this improbable fiction is laid upon the testimony whereof the most ancient is six hundred years after the pretended matter of fact."—All this is to as little purpose as the rest. For, first, that the Jews had forgot their native language, and learned the Chaldean in that seventy years, is the unanimous opinion of men versed in these matters; both the Buxtorfs, and all others that I have read of; (Mayerus only excepted, whose reasons are examined, *Proleg.* iii.) And this they could not choose but

do, (though they kept the language for two hundred years in Egypt,) because they lived dispersed over Assyria, under their several lords and masters, whose servants and vassals they were, and therefore might easily forget their own language, and must of necessity learn the Assyrian, where they were born and brought up; whereas in Egypt they lived all together in one place, not mingled with the Egyptians. Now, if they forgot their language, and changed it, why not the character too? Or if some of them kept both, yet the Chaldee must needs be better known to them than the other, as being in daily use among them: yet it is not denied, but that as the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, so of the character too, did continue among the Priests and Scribes, and among some few of the old men, who might remember the standing of the old Temple. But what were these to the multitude of the common people, who understood only the tongue where they were born and bred; and so could have little knowledge of any other character than that in common use where they lived? And hence it was, that, when the Law was read, the Levites were fain to expound it in the Chaldee tongue, that the people might understand it; and hence came that custom of reading the verse first in Hebrew, and then in the Chaldee, as I have seen an old MS. brought from Ormus so written; first

the verse in Hebrew, and then the same in the Chaldee. Nor was the Canon of the Old Testament perfected before Esdras, as it is now, and all the Books in one Volume, or the Copies thereof as common among the people, as the Bible with us, as our Author imagines. Some Copies of the Law might remain among the Levites and Priests, by which they instructed the people; but the whole Canon, and all the Books of it reduced into one Volume as now, I doubt he will not find before that time. Besides, the Copies they had were much depraved, and had suffered much, (as this Author acknowledgeth,) and so were not fit for use, till they were rectified; else Esdras and the great Synagogue needed not to have spent so much labour about restoring the Law and other Books as they did.

XVII. As for the testimonies produced, I deny that the eldest is six hundred years after the matter of fact. The chief evidence, and most real testimony, is from the coins, which were near five hundred years before this change was made; and for the written testimonies, they are of the ancientest that are extant among the Jews, who have scarce any of unquestionable and undoubted certainty before the Talmuds, except the Chaldee Paraphrases, or some of the Apocryphal Books, where no occasion was given to mention such things. These, among other things, were

preserved among them by tradition; and, had not their dispersions and banishments over the world forced the compiling of the Mishna and the Talmuds, this among their other traditions had been lost. After all, our Author concludes, p. 266, "seeing," *the vanity of all that he had said before*, "that it is probable that the old letters being excommunicate by Esdras, with the Samaritans, laying aside the old letters, because of their difficulty, he, together with the new, introduced also the points to facilitate their reading." The latter part of which speech, as we deny upon grounds formerly shewed, so the other we receive, that Esdras laid aside the old letters, (not because of their difficulty, for they appear rather to be easier than the other,) but because the Jews had been more used to the Chaldee, and that they might not seem to have communion with the Samaritans, (as is elsewhere proved,) and that he brought in the Assyrian, which hath since continued; and, therefore, we need no more proof in this matter, when we have the confession of our Adversary.

XVIII. Thus I have shortly run over these *Considerations*, and examined the most material passages which contained any thing worth the observing; entreating the reader, who desires more full satisfaction, to have recourse to the [G] *Prolegomena* and *Appendix themselves*. By

what hath been now observed, sufficient warning is given to the reader, not to be too credulous, or to take any thing upon trust without examination or trial; and by these *specimina* of his candour and love of truth, I desire him to judge of the rest of his Discourse. If he shall think fit to reply, though I cannot expect he should retract any thing he hath written; for I have known by long experience, that some men, as if they had an infallible spirit annexed to their chair, are past acknowledging any error in whatsoever comes from them; yet if he think fit to draw this saw of contention further, or as he threatens in diverse places to make further discoveries; I shall advise, 1. That he would be careful to state the controversy truly, and relate the arguments faithfully and entirely, and not lamely, much less to pervert them; and to that end, as Saint Jerom wished, Advers. Errores Joh. Hierosol. "Ut verbis meis sensum meum loquatur," *that he would deliver my opinion in my own words;* (as I have done his;) and not substitute what he pleases, or make his own consectaries his adversary's opinions. 2. That he would proceed scholastically, and keep close to the point in hand; forbearing extravagant popular declamations. 3. That he would lay aside all passion and prejudice; for as Aristotel. in Elench. ὀργίζοντες οὐ δύνανται φυλάττεσθαι τὰ πάντα. Or if he cannot

but write in haste and in heat, yet that he would review and weigh his own conceptions; avoiding rash and precipitate censures; and that he would remember, that as an account must be given for every idle word spoken, so much more for what is written or printed, as being done with more deliberation. 4. That he would not join promiscuously what is said by other authors, either Romanists or Protestants, with what is said in the *Prolegomena* as if all that they affirm were to be charged upon the *Prolegomena*. For by not distinguishing what is said by each, but by jumbling all together, it is cunningly insinuated to the unwary reader, as if all held the same. For I am not to answer for any thing, but what is said in the *Prolegomena*.

XIX. These rules if he shall observe, I shall promise to deal in like manner with him, if any rejoinder shall be found needful. But if he shall persist in the way he hath begun, I shall think silence the best answer, having better employments, wherein to spend my hours; and shall rest in the testimony of my own conscience, that I have in all my endeavours about this great work, proposed no other end, than the Glory of God, in the preserving of his sacred truth, both in the Originals, and ancient Translations, both for the true reading, and right sense or meaning, pure and entire to posterity, against both the

casual mistakes that may happen in some, and the wilful corruptions and falsifications of Sectaries and Heretics, which never more boldly, nor in greater numbers than now, endeavoured to deprave or corrupt it, either in the letter, or sense, or both. And though these weak endeavours be attended (as it hath been the fate of all public works of this nature) with obloquy in some emulous and contradicting spirits, yet I shall think it sufficient that I have had the general approbation of men truly learned, judicious, and pious. And for those that are otherwise, I doubt not but the work will live in after ages, when their invectives shall be buried in oblivion: For,

" *Pascitur in vivis livor, post fata quiescit;*
" *Tunc suus ex merito quemque tuetur honos.*"

THE END OF THE CONSIDERATOR CONSIDERED.

SOME

OBSERVATIONS

UPON THE

PRECEDING VINDICATION,

CHIEFLY WITH A VIEW

TO

REFERENCES UPON THE SUBJECT,

BY

THE COMPILER

OF THE

MEMOIRS OF DR. WALTON, &c.

OBSERVATIONS,

&c.

P. 2. [A] "*a reverend author.*" Dr. Walton here alludes, I presume, to a passage in a sermon preached before the King, Sept. 2, 1623, by Dr. G. Warburton, (afterwards dean of Wells,) and published in that year. "*Inter duos latrones hodiè crucifigitur Ecclesia Christi,* (Hieron.) The Church of Christ, as Christ himselfe, is at this day crucified betweene two theeves; her peace disturbed on both sides. On the one side are the Jesuites, and their adherents; a strong and impetuous faction in the Church of Rome, that maintaine those transalpine tenets most injurious to Christian monarchs, the pope's supremacie over kings, his power of deposing, of killing them, of acquitting subjects of their naturall liege allegiance, and absolving traytors for the murther of their prince. On the other side, certaine scrupulous brethren of our owne, inflamed with a precipitate zeale against our corruptions, as they call them, both in doctrine and discipline, have with their clamorous libels, most repleat with unthankfulnesse to God for his mercies to this land, with slander to our ecclesiasticall government, and with prejudice to the civil state, kindled a strange fire of contention in this nationall Church." Serm. pp. 35, 36.

P. 4. [B] "*that magnificent work.*" See Le Long, Biblioth. Sac. cap. 1. Bib. Polygl. Antverp. Bowyer on the first printed Polyglots, Orig. of Printing, p. 129. And Dibdin's Introduct. to the Classics, 3d edit. vol. i. p. 8. et seq. where several curious particulars of this *wonder of the world*, as it has been called, are related.

P. 5. [C] "*that splendid work of the Parisian Bible.*" Compare Le Long, ut supr. Bowyer, p. 132. and Dibdin, p. 11.

Ibid. [D] "*the last English translation.*" See the preceding Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Walton, ch. 3. p. 101, et seq.

Ibid. [E] "*one—passed by and not employed in the work.*" The learned but very conceited and injudicious Hugh Broughton. See Lewis's Essay on the English Versions of the Bible, 2d edit. p. 297. And a Vindication of our Authorized Translation, 1819, p. 69.

P. 8. [F] "*a late pamphlet.*" The Vindication of the Hebrew and Greek Texts, published in 1659, by Dr. John Owen, dean of Christ Church, Oxford, during the Usurpation of Cromwell. Nothing can be adduced more explanatory of this controversy, than the observation of a gentleman who has very recently given to the world Memoirs of the Life, &c. of Dr. Owen. "The progress of Hebrew literature has discovered, that the fears, entertained by Owen, respecting the doctrines of the Polyglot, were wholly groundless: and his language, that those who asserted that the Scriptures had suffered in the same manner with other books, bordered on atheism, was rash and improper; as the event has proved. He disclaims all personal motives in the considerations he was led to throw out on the Polyglot; professes not to have been acquainted

with Walton, and but little with his chief coadjutors; and *pretends to no profound acquaintance with the department of literature, to which the Prolegomena and Appendix of the Polyglot properly belong.*"——And yet he scrupled not to impugn assertions, which those Prolegomena and that Appendix contain!—"It is unnecessary now," the learned biographer of Dr. Owen proceeds, "to canvass his objections. His fears magnified his expectations of danger, and multiplied his difficulties; and neither the cause of sacred learning, nor his own fame, would have suffered, had he never written a sentence on the subject. He was not allowed to pass unanswered. *Walton immediately published an able, but ill-tempered reply,* THE CONSIDERATOR CONSIDERED, &c. *It cannot be concealed, and ought not to be denied, that Walton had greatly the better of his antagonist in this controversy.* He possessed eminent learning, great critical acumen, and all that patient industry which was necessary for the successful prosecution of his very arduous undertaking. These qualifications, combined with abundance of leisure, with the assistance of learned associates, and with enthusiastic devotedness to the cause which he espoused, enabled him to bring his original work to a perfection that left all its predecessors far behind, and to meet any antagonist, with advantages, of whose importance he was sufficiently aware. The time and talents of Owen had been chiefly devoted to very different pursuits. In doctrinal, exegetical, and controversial theology, he had then but few equals, and no superior. In these departments he shone with distinguished lustre, and to their cultivation he had consecrated all the faculties and ardour of no ordinary mind. His

public labours, and numerous writings, must have left him but little time or inclination for the dry pursuits of verbal criticism; *and, on this account, it would have been better had he left the subject to others.* But, while I freely concede the palm of victory in this contest to Walton, it is impossible to compliment the spirit, with which he fought for and achieved it. He never condescends so much as to name Owen, although the work which he answers was not anonymous. He breathes a tone of defiance and contempt, alike uncalled for and unsuitable; but probably dictated as much by the political changes in prospect, as by personal dislike of Owen. The Ex-Vicechancellor of Oxford, though not then *a son of the Church of England*, a title to which Walton attached no ordinary importance, was not unworthy to be named with the most learned of her progeny; and even the Editor of the Polyglot was not entiled to school him as a dunce."— I pause again, with submission to the biographer of Dr. Owen, to observe, that a man professing no profound acquaintance with the literature which another critically illustrates, and yet deliberately assaulting and depreciating it, can hardly earn, in such a vain endeavour, a name of higher import than a dunce; and therefore such an one can be treated by him, whose labours he insults and misrepresents, only as a blunderer who surely deserves to be schooled, or as a trifler provoking derision. There was at one time a fierce defender of Dr. Owen against the attack of Dr. Walton, who considered the latter as not to be compared, in point of criticism, with the former; of whose aid, in his narrative of this controversy, Mr. Orme has not availed himself! This person was Mr. Joseph

Cooper, who published a vehement dissertation, entitled "Domus Mosaicæ Clavis, sive Legis Sepimentum; in quo punctorum Hebraicorum adstruitur antiquitas; eaque omnia, cùm accentualia tùm vocalia, ipsis literis fuisse coæva, argumentis, undique petitis, demonstratur. Quæ verò in contrarium ab Elia Levita primipilo, Ludovico Cappello, D. Doctore *Waltono*, &c. adducuntur, multa cum fidelitate examini subjiciuntur et diluuntur, &c." 8vo. Lond. 1673. No wonder then, that this critic, speaking of Cappellus, boldly says, "cujus rationes Buxtorfius junior expendit et confutavit;" next of Dr. *Walton*, "cujus sententiam Bibliorum Polyglottorum, quo jure quave injuria Prolegomenis insertam, *disputatione planè nervosa expugnavit Dr. Owen*;" and then of Dr. Prideaux, "quem unà cum Ludovico Cappello, et Doct. *Walton*, argumentorum tum pondere, tum numero, obrutum in hoc quali quali tractatulo invenire licet!" Thus overwhelming these three unfortuate scholars, he is not content that the reader should witness their extinction with any other sentiment than that of detestation; for he says, "Habetis tandem, lectores candidi, *natales horrendi istius monstri, quod, obstetricante Elia Levita, primitus natum Lud. Cappellus, Johannes Prideauxius*, et *Brianus Waltonus*, cum aliis è nostris, *postmodum educârunt*, &c." Præf. ad Lectorem. Instead of citing other presumptuous passages from this forgotten yet learned volume, I will copy a few words more from the biographer of Dr. Owen. "His [Walton's] remarks on the motives and designs of Owen are bitter and unchristian, and only reflect dishonour on himself. And surely the man, who, after enjoying the favour of Cromwell, had the ingratitude to erase his

acknowledgment of it, and to insert the name of Charles, from whom his work had derived no benefit, (though it afterwards procured a bishopric for its author,) has not the highest claims to credit for Christian simplicity and sincerity." Memoirs of Dr. Owen, &c. By William Orme, 8vo. London, 1820, pp. 271, 272, 273. In answer to these concluding remarks of Mr. Orme, I refer the reader to Dr. Walton's own publication, and the vast importance of the subject, in the preceding pages of this volume; and next to the account, given by Dr. Walton himself, in the Memoirs of his Life and Writings which I have brought together, respecting the alleged favour of Cromwell, respecting also the concern which Charles the Second appears to have shewn for the Polyglot, and respecting other matters connected with this subject, hitherto suppressed, or overpassed; which may lead the reader to a different conclusion than that made by Mr. Orme. See the first volume of this work, pp. 82, 83, 84.

P. 12. [G] "*Archbishop Usher, Bishop Prideaux,* &c." Of these learned men Usher was the only one, who lived to witness the completion of the Polyglot.

P. 28. [H] "*not impeached or prejudiced thereby.*" It has been abundantly shewn, that by Various Readings the sacred text has not only been not prejudiced, but been cleared and vindicated. "I am forced to confess with grief," says the great Bentley, "that several well-meaning priests, of greater zeal than knowledge, have often by their own false alarms and panic both frighted others of their own side, and given advantage to their enemies. What an uproar once was there, as if all were ruined and undone, when Cappellus wrote one book against the antiquity of the

Hebrew points, and another for various lections in the Hebrew text itself? And yet time and experience have cured them of their imaginary fears; and the great author in his grave has now that honour universally, which the few only of his own age paid him when alive. The case is and will be the same with the learned Dr. Mill. For what is it, that Whitby so inveighs and exclaims at? The doctor's labours, says he, make the whole text precarious; and expose both the Reformation to the Papists, and religion itself to the Atheists. God forbid! We'll still hope better things. For surely those Various Readings existed before in the several exemplars. Dr. Mill did not make and coin them; he only exhibited them to our view. If religion, therefore, was true before, though such Various Readings were in being; it will be as true, and consequently as safe still, though every body sees them. Depend on't; no truth, no matter of fact, fairly laid open, can ever subvert true religion." Phil. Lips. P. I. §. 32. "As to what our Deists allege from the great number of Various Readings, if they had but as little learning, or at least ingenuity, as they pretend to piety, they would acknowledge them to be of no consequence to the substance of religion. They appear plainly to be the effect of human frailty, inaccuracy, and mistake, in transcribing or translating, and what might escape the best and most diligent writer. And no one surely will pretend, that Divine Providence was under any obligation miraculously to continue the infallibility of the authors of Holy Writ down to every librarian and amanuensis, to prevent their making mistakes. Such objections would make one imagine, that there is nothing to be urged against

the genuineness of the Scriptures, but what will, upon due examination, add strength to their authority, and end in the praise of them. For the multitude of Various Readings are so far from arising from any design, or contrivance, to vitiate or falsify the text, that notwithstanding Manuscripts have been collected from the most distant parts of the world; and the most diligent search every where made for them; and more of them met with than of any other books, as the constant use of those writings made them to be oftener transcribed, and all of them collated with the most religious exactness; there is not any one point of faith or morality, which is not to be found in the very worst Copy, and as capable of being proved by the most inaccurate as the most correct. (See Cappellus, as he is quoted by Dr. Walton, Proleg. cap. vi. § 2.) Which is a sufficient demonstration that there has been no collusion, no interpolating, no designed alteration of Copies. And as for the native and genuine sense of the Scriptures, 'tis so far from being the more precarious from the number of Various Readings, that 'tis rendered the more clear and certain from them; (Walton, Proleg. cap. vi. §. 5.) the only difficulty being to find out the true reading from the false, which is not so great, as may be imagined, to a skilful and able critic; the observation of a very few rules being all that is necessary, as Dr. Walton has sufficiently shewn, Proleg. cap. vi. §. 6." Dr. A. Young's Historical Dissertation on Idolatrous Corruptions in Religion, vol. 2. p. 242, et seq. "Benè egit Waltonus de Variis Scripturæ S. Lectionibus capite vi; et optandum foret, *ut hoc caput legeretur ab omnibus, qui laborem Codicum conferendorum vel non necessarium, vel adeò noxium,*

judicant. Probavit suam sententiam non solum ex experientia, h. e. ex dissensu Codicum antiquioribus et recentioribus temporibus observato, sed etiam ex virorum doctissimorum testimoniis, itemque eorum, qui acerrimi textus Hebræi defensores fuerunt. Removit inanem periculi timorem ex Codicum collatione timendi textus integritati. Regulas quoque dedit, Proleg. cap. vi. §. 6. de judicandis Variis Lectionibus, sed, quod nolim negare, non satis subtiles, neque accuratè definitas. Nam illud, *ceteris paribus*, aut, *non temerè*, magnam habet ambiguitatem. Sed de his videndi sunt alii in his regulis definiendis magis accurati; inprimis S. R. ERNESTI in *Instit. Interpretis Nov. Test.* Nam quæ leges judicio super Variis Lectionibus Nov. Test. scribuntur, eas quoque in Vet. Test. servandas esse non dubito. Igitur nihil dicam ad has à Waltono allatas regulas emendandas vel illustrandas." Præf. I. A. Dathe in Waltoni Prolegom. Lips. 1777, pp. xxxviii, xxxix. Dr. Walton, we find, agreed with Usher, rather than with Cappellus, in a rule of the greatest importance respecting Various Readings; which they, who study the Holy Scriptures, should carefully observe. See the Considerator considered, chap. vi. §. 10. I venture to recommend a learned Discourse, illustrating the use, value, and improvement of Various Readings, preached before the University of Oxford, October 18, 1761, by W. Worthington, D.D. chaplain to the Archbishop of York; and published at the request of the vice-chancellor and heads of houses. It is indeed most worthy to be reprinted.

P. 34. [I] "*Hobbes's Leviathan.*" About the time, when Dr. Walton published the Vindication of his

Polyglot, the authors who had written against the pernicious publication of Hobbes were numerous; and they are afterwards noticed in an account of Hobbes's Life, which yet details not all of them. One of the most eminent was Dr. Seth Ward, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury. We are infinitely obliged to those who have detected the sophistry of Hobbes, and the tendency of his maxims to corrupt morals; especially as some have spoken highly of his style in later times, who have either wholly overlooked, or not sufficiently deprecated, the danger both of his religious and political principles.

P. 39. [K] "*Various Readings*, &c." See the preceding note, H.

Ibid. [L] "*the novelty of the Hebrew punctuation.*" See Dathe's Præf. in Waltoni Prolegom. p. xxix. "Quæ Waltonus contra punctorum vocalium et accentuum antiquitatem attulit argumenta, *eadem sunt quibus* CAPPELLUS *eam contra* BUXTORFIUM *impugnavit.* Est hæc temporum nostrorum felicitas, quòd controversia illa, quæ olim tanta animorum vehementia ab utraque parte agitata est, jam quidèm partim moderatius, partim felicius, disceptatur. SCHULTENSIUS quidèm primus fuit, quod ego sciam, *qui ostendit neutri parti victoriam posse concedi.*" The *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* of CAPPELLUS "contains almost all the arguments, which have been since used against the antiquity of the Hebrew points; and they are stated so fully and clearly, that the subject appeared to be exhausted in the first essay of it. But as the opinion, that the Hebrew points were of modern origin, was likely, when first advanced, to be regarded as an infringement even of the text, CAPPELLUS had the

precaution to send his work in manuscript to be examined by BUXTORF, who returned it with the request that it might not be printed. CAPPELLUS then sent it to ERPENIUS, professor of the Oriental languages at Leyden, who so approved of it, that with the permission of the author he printed it at Leyden in 1624. BUXTORF made no reply to it: and as he died about five years afterwards, he left it to be answered by his son, who was likewise professor in the University of Basel. But many years elapsed before the younger BUXTORF had prepared an answer to CAPPELLUS. In the mean time JOHANNES MORINUS, one of the Fathers of the Oratory at Paris, attacked the antiquity of the Hebrew letters in his *Exercitationes ecclesiasticæ*, printed at Paris in 1631. And as the antiquity of the letters appeared more important, perhaps also more defensible, than the antiquity of the points, the younger BUXTORF made his first essay in a defence of the Hebrew letters, entitled *Dissertatio de literarum Hebraicarum antiquitate.* The precise year when this treatise was first published is not known: but in 1645 it received an answer from CAPPELLUS, in his *Diatriba de veris et antiquis Hebræorum literis*, in which CAPPELLUS contended, as MORINUS had already done, that the true and the ancient letters of the Hebrews were no other than the Samaritan. In 1648 the younger BUXTORF made his reply to CAPPELLUS, *on the subject of the points*, in a work entitled, *Tractatus de punctorum vocalium et accentuum in libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis origine, antiquitate, et authoritate, oppositus Arcano punctationis revelato* LUDOVICI CAPPELLI. To this work CAPPELLUS prepared an Answer, entitled, *Arcani punctationis*

Vindiciæ. But he died before the publication of it: and his son, to whom it was left in manuscript, did not publish it, till many years after the death also of his opponent BUXTORF. This controversy about the antiquity of the Hebrew letters and points must be carefully distinguished from another, in which CAPPELLUS and the younger BUXTORF were likewise engaged, on the integrity of the Hebrew text: for the two controversies, though in some measure connected, and frequently confounded, rest on totally distinct grounds. In the opinion, that the Hebrew or Chaldee character was not used by the Jews till after the Babylonian Captivity, and *that the present system of vowel points was introduced in a still later age, the most distinguished Hebrew scholars, with a very few exceptions, have sided with* CAPPELLUS." Bishop Marsh's Theological Lectures, P. II. Lect. x. The critics were at first greatly divided upon the subject of the Hebrew points. The list of those, who sided with CAPPELLUS, has been given by one who differed from him; and a splendid list it is. It is more full than any which Dr. Walton has brought forward, in the Considerator considered; and therefore is here cited. It contains the great names of *Elias Levita, Lewis Cappel, Thomas Erpenius, Isaac Casaubon, J. J. Scaliger, Isaac Vossius, J. Drusius, Arnold Boate, Andrew Rivet, Lewis de Dieu, Hugh Grotius, Frederick Spanheim, Festus Hommius, Theodore Beza, John Selden, Brian Walton, Andrew Sennert, James Basnage, F. Burmann, Richard Simon, Philip à Limborch, Stephen Morin, C. Vitringa, J. le Clerc, C. A. Heumann,* and others. See Dissert. Critica de Litteris, &c. Heb. ab Andr. Chr. Petersen, p. 34. § vi. To these I may add J. B.

L'Advocat, C. F. Houbigant, Bishop Lowth, and Dr. Kennicott. At the same time, it must be observed, several men of great learning have also illustrated and defended the opinion of CAPPELLUS'S opponent. But of these some have lost their temper, and so betrayed the weakness of their cause. This may surely be said of Wasmuth, in his *Vindiciæ S. Hebrææ*; of our countryman, Joseph Cooper, in his *Domus Mosaicæ Clavis*, (mentioned in the preceding note F. p. 315;) and of several minor critics, at home and abroad, who have raged furiously both against Walton and Cappellus. Great Britain, however, has not wanted men of less irritability, who have strenuously defended the Hebrew vowel-points. Such have been Mr. Thomas Boston, Mr. Peter Whitfield, and Dr. James Robertson; the production of the first bearing the following description: *Tractatus Stigmologicus, Hebræo-Biblicus. Quo accentuum Hebræorum doctrina traditur, variusque eorum in explanandâ S. Scriptura usus exponitur*, &c. *Amst.* 1738; of the second, *On the Hebrew Points, Liverpool*, 1748; and of the last, *Dissertatio de genuina punctorum vocalium Hebraicorum antiquitate, Edinb.* 1770.

P. 50. [M] "*Concerning the purity and authority of the Original Texts, &c.*" The observation of Dathe, upon what Dr. Walton has here noticed, is worthy of great attention. "Quanquam verò textus originarios à corruptione, quæ nimirum sit omnium Codicum superstitum, liberos esse defendit WALTONUS, eosque puros et integros ad nostra usque tempora pervenisse; *tamen hanc eorum integritatem non restrigendum esse rectè monet, adunam tantùm illam textus Hebræi* (nam

de textu Græco non amplius disputatur) *recensionem, quæ Masorethica vocari solet.* Sed quemadmodum librorum Nov. Test. integritas non ex paucorum Codd. sed ex omnium quotquot supersunt collatione probatur, ita etiam de libris Vet. Test. debebat judicari, nec eorum integritas ex Judæorum criticorum diligentia, cæteroquin non contemnenda, tantùm demonstrari. Quod faciunt ii, qui conatus virorum doctissimorum, in conferendis codicibus Hebræis susceptos, improbant, contemnunt et tanquam periculosos rejiciunt. Quanquam hujus erroris vanitatem WALTONUS jam in præcedenti capite ostenderat, cùm de Var. Lectt. earumque colligendarum necessitate ageret, tamen *denuò ei probandum erat, cum textus originalis integritatem defenderet, huic nullo modo obstare sententiam de Variis Lectionibus;* Prol. viii. §. 12, 13, 14, *plures esse in Codice Hebræo diversas Lectiones, quàm sint à Judæis observatæ; Judæorum scribas minimè habuisse privilegium ἀναμαρτησίας, et propterea Masorethicam textus Hebræi recensionem non opus esse perfectissimum, consummatissimum, quod novas Codicum collationes inutiles reddat et minùs necessarias; neque* HIERONYMUM, *aut* EUSEBIUM, *sæpè de dissensu Codicum Hebræorum loquentes, eum integritati Scripturæ Sacræ periculosum judicasse,* §. 13, 14. Quæ cùm WALTONUS etiam ad Nov. Test. transtulerat, §. 15, 16, subjungit tandem disputationem adversus *ἀνθεντίαν* Versionis Vulgatæ à Pontificiis assertam, lectu non indignam." Præf. in Waltoni Prolegom. pp. xlii, xliii.

P. 54. [N] This letter has been published separately; and is also found in Dr. Parr's Collection of

Archbishop Usher's Letters, pp. 569—579; and in the third volume of Cappellus's *Critica Sacra*, edited by J. G. Scharfenberg, Hal. Madg. 1786, pp. 635—659.

P. 62. [O] "*Arnold Bootius*, &c." See some notices of this critic in the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, pp. 60, et seq. Many of his letters to Archbishop Usher are preserved in Dr. Parr's Collection, fol. London, 1686.

P. 66. [P] "*that they made more frequent use of the Greek* LXX. *than the Hebrew.*" See the Considerator considered again, chap. ix. §. 15. "The Septuagint was publicly read in the synagogues for near three hundred years before Christ: our Saviour and the Apostles used it, and cited it more frequently than the Hebrew text." See also Dr. Prideaux's Connect. of the Old and New Test. P. II. B. I. "That there was a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, made in the time that the Ptolemies reigned in Egypt, is not to be doubted: for we still have the Book, and it is the same which was in use in our Saviour's time; for most of those passages which the holy penmen of the New Testament do, in the Greek Original of it, quote out of the Old Testament, are now found *verbatim* in this Version." And Dr. Mill, on Hebrews xiii. 25. "Scripturæ Veteris Testamenti, non secundum Hebraicam veritatem, quam vocant, sed LXX. Interpretum, (in hac Epistola,) perpetuò citatæ: et quidem iis in locis, in quibus si reponerentur Hebræa, non modò periret vis argumentationis Apostolicæ, sed ne quidèm ullus foret argumentationi locus."

P. 92. [Q] "*the wonderful consent of all Translations.*" See Dr. Brett's Dissertation on the Ancient

Versions of the Bible, 2d. edit. pp. 141, et seq. This is his conclusion, p. 144. "We have reason to admire and adore the Providence of God; that notwithstanding the Holy Scriptures have been dispersed into almost all the nations of the world, and translated into most languages; have been transcribed by Christians of many different persuasions and opinions; and that beside the various readings which have proceeded from oversights, or ignorance, or rashness, there are some which may seem to have been made to serve the particular opinions of a party; yet not any article of faith, any doctrine or duty, any promise or threatening has been affected thereby, or rendered precarious by any various reading or corruption."

P. 93. [R] "*as that of Shiloh*, &c." Some learned men have bestowed more labour, than was requisite, in confuting the strained and frivolous interpretations of this passage by modern Jews. Ancient and very learned expositors among the Jews did not dispute the sense of this illustrious prophecy; but admitted, that it referred to the time of our Lord's coming into the world. Onkelos thus paraphrased the verse. *There shall never be wanting a ruler out of the house of Judah, nor a chief judge out of his son's sons, until Messiah shall come, to whom the kingdom belongs; and the nations shall hear or obey him.* See Critical Notes on Scripture, 8vo. London, 1747, p. 8. See also An Address to the Jews, by John Xeres, containing his reasons for leaving the Jewish and embracing the Christian religion, 8vo. London, 1710, pp. 30, 31. Our countryman Mede has written an admirable discourse on this text, Serm. 4to. edit. 1642, pp. 144, et seq.

P. 102 [S] "*and by apparent reason.*" See what is before cited upon this subject in the notes H and M.

P. 103. [T] "*how justly we have shewed, Proleg.* ix." I must refer the reader particularly to the 18th section of that chapter of the Prolegomena. See also Dathe's extensive remarks on this chapter, Præf. in Prol. pp. xlvi. et seq. He opens, justly, at variance with Dr. Walton, "De Versionibus Græcis, præcipuè LXXII seniorum, copiosè egit WALTONUS cap. ix. sed, quod ad hanc inprimis attinet, non ita, ut omnibus, quæ super ea scripserit, possim assentiri. Nimirum defendit historiam seu potius fabulam Aristeæ de origine hujus versionis, quam nostra ætate nemo credit, &c."

P. 109. [U] "*especially that in* 1 *John* v. 8." Meaning the omission of the seventh verse; in favour of the genuineness of which, notwithstanding the severe castigation of Achdeacon Travis for defending it by Professor Porson, and notwithstanding the consent of many critics, both at home and abroad, to give it up, there is not so weak a body of testimony as some are content to believe. Some existing MSS. though few, contain it. Manuscripts, known to have existed, have been authentically stated to contain it. Of the very numerous MSS. in various libraries, yet uncollated, who shall say how many of them want it? Not a few of the Christian Fathers maintained it. Selden appears to have supported it. Mill defended it. Bentley indeed read a lecture at Cambridge to prove it spurious; but, says Whiston, his learned contemporary, "*he dares not now wholly omit it in the text of his edition of the New Testament,* which he has promised, but not yet performed." But

let Bentley speak for himself on the subject of this verse, though his edition certainly did not appear: "What will be the event about the said verse of John, I myself know not yet; *having not used all the old copies that I have information of.* But by this you see, that in my proposed work the fate of that verse will be a mere *question of fact.* You endeavour to prove, (and that's all you aspire to,) that it *may* have been writ by the Apostle, being consonant to his other doctrine. This I concede to you; and if the fourth century knew that text, let it come in, in God's name: but if that age did not know it, then Arianism in its height was beat down without the help of that verse: and let the *fact* prove as it will, the *doctrine* is unshaken." Lett. to some unknown correspondent, Bentley's Epist. ed. Burney, 1807, p. 238. Just and satisfactory as the concluding remark is, and proper as are the observations which precede it, still the verse ought not yet entirely to be given up. The lost MSS. of Stephens may yet again meet the critical eye; and MSS. at present only known to exist, as well as many at present undiscovered, may compensate future examination with the desired discovery. I will only add, that among the many critics who have impugned, or maintained, the authenticity of this verse, I have not yet found one, not even the sagacious Porson himself, who has named or referred to a fellow-labourer in the contest, the Rev. T. Dawson; who is the author of *Disceptatio Epistolaris de Cœlestibus Testimoniis,* 1 *John* v. 7. *In qua, ex binis Manuscriptis eximiis, indubio evincitur ἀνθενρία istius versiculi,* &c." The author appears to have been an amanuensis of Dr. Cave, and the tract is worth reading.

P. 112. [W] "*concerning which I have spoken at large, Proleg.* viii." See Dathe's Præf. in Prolegom. p. xliv. "In cap. viii. distinctè et accuratè egit WALTONUS de Masora, hoc est, de iis, quæ Judæi Critici ad textus Hebræi lectionem emendandam et conservandam fecerunt. In historia quidèm hujus Criticæ Judaicæ secutus est inprimis BUXTORFIUM, ex cujus *Tiberiade*, seu *Clave Masoræ*, epitomen dedit, quam tirones cum fructu legent. In judicio verò super his laboribus Judæorum ad S. textus conservationem susceptis, CAPPELLI et MORINI amplexus est sententiam. Qui plures auctores nosse cupit, qui cùm universè de Masora scripserunt, tùm de singulis ejus partibus, evolvat WOLFIUM in Biblioth. Hebr. tom. ii. pag. 460, seqq. et tom. iv. pag. 207, seqq."

P. 120. [X] "*that incomparably learned man*, &c." With the character which Dr. Walton here gives Grotius, in regard to his earnest study for the peace of the Church, and his endeavour to close up rather than to make wider the breaches and wounds of Christendom, compare what Dr. Hammond has said of him in his letter to Mr. Smith, Mem. of Dr. Walton, p. 257.

P. 130. [Y] "*belonging to Caius College in Cambridge.*" Dr. Kennicott has described the contents of this MS. See his account of the Hebrew MSS. in England, disposed under every Book of the Old Testament, at the end of his *State of the Printed Hebrew Text of the Old Testament considered*, Oxf. 1759.

P. 131. [Z] "*is their diligence to be condemned*, &c." No, says a greater critic than Walton himself: "It has been the common sense of men of letters, that numbers of Manuscripts do not make a text precarious, but are useful, nay necessary, to its establishment and

certainty. And as Scaliger, Casaubon, Heinsius, &c. when they designed to publish a correct edition of an author, *first laboured to procure all the Manuscripts they could hear of, as the only means that promised laudable success;* so Stephanus, Junius, Curcellæus, Walton, Fell, and Mill, *proceeded in the same method.*" Bentley, Phil. Lips. §. 32.

P. 133. [A] "*all do constantly agree*, &c." See the preceding note Q. Blackwall, in his *Sacred Classics*, has cited this fine passage in the Considerator with much approbation, and made it the text of his own remarks upon the subject. vol. 2. pp. 336, et seq.

P. 148. [B] "*sought out, and collated by the most reverend Usher.*" See what has been said of this collection, Mem. of Dr. Walton, pp. 79, 182.

Ibid. [C] "*the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament*, &c." The Alexandrian Manuscript, containing both the Old and the New Testament is now preserved in the British Museum. Dr. Woide, of the Museum, many years since, printed from it an accurate fac-simile edition of the New Testament; and carried the age of it to the latter part of the fourth century; though Michaelis has placed it at least two centuries later. Mr. Baber, of the same national establishment, has with no less exactness and splendour already given to the world from this venerable Manuscript the whole of the historical and prophetical books; and is proceeding with the remainder of the Old Testament. I noticed the exertions of this learned and indefatigable scholar in the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, p. 256, but to a less extent than they have attained. As to the age of the Alexandrian MS. we have already seen the difference of opinion between Woide and Michaelis. Semler thinks that it was

written in the seventh century. But certainty cannot be obtained. The Vatican MS. contends with the Alexandrian the estimation also of age. I will subjoin an observation or two of Ernesti; "Antiquissimi putantur *Vaticanus* et *Alexandrinus*, literis uncialibus continentibus scripti: in quibus tamen magnus est eruditorum dissensus, utri primæ partes debeantur; aliis pro Vaticano pugnantibus, aliis pro Alexandrino. De hoc inprimis videndi editores Versionis LXX. Anglicani Proleg. T. II. c. I. propos. XV. s. de illo Zaccagnius l. c. p. 56. de utroque Wetstenius in Proleg. N. T." Ernesti, Inst. Interpr. Nov. Test. ed. Lips. 1809. pp. 193, 194. Montfaucon and Blanchini pronounce the Vatican MS. of the fifth century.

Ibid. [D] "*the Codex Claromontanus.*" Believed to be written in the seventh or eighth century.

Ibid. [E] "*that which Beza sent to Cambridge.*" Of this Manuscript also, as of the Alexandrian, the age is disputed. It has been carried as high as the second century, and has also been consigned to the seventh; but that it was not written beyond the fifth century, is the opinion to which most deference has been shewn.

Ibid. [F] "*that Greek MS. of the Chronicles.*" See Dr. Walton's collation of this MS. in the sixth volume of his Polyglot; where he describes it thus: "Liber Chronicorum MS. antiquus in Bibliotheca Publica Cantabrigiensi, qui erat quondam Theodori, Archiep. Cantuariensis anno 668, cum Editione Romana collatus."

Ibid. [G] "*that ancient remnant of Sir Robert Cotton's MS. of Genesis.*" Dr. Walton considers this as the most ancient of all his MSS. See his account

of the collation of it by Usher and Young, as well as by himself, Bib. Polygl. vi. 109. Grabe pursued the same kind of collation with this MS. as Dr. Walton had done; which remained in the Bodleian Library unpublished till the year 1778; when Dr. H. Owen accurately printed it, viz. *Collatio Codicis Cottoniani Geneseos cum Editione Romana à viro clarissimo Joh. Ern. Grabe jam olim facta, nunc demum summa cura edita.* See what Dr. Walton says of the loss of the remainder of the Pentateuch, Genesis alone being saved. Memoirs of his Life and Writings, p. 289. This most valuable MS. of Genesis, however, has, since the times of Walton and Grabe, nearly perished. "The Book of Genesis in the Cottonian Library, which was written in large Greek capitals, without distinction of words, and had the history painted on most of the pages, *is almost all destroyed by the late unfortunate fire,* [*in* 1731;] and the leaves of what remains, and consequently the writing in a just proportion, are contracted into a less compass." Casley's Catalogue of the King's MSS. 1734, Pref. pp. viii, ix. This learned librarian gives a specimen of the MS. on the eleventh of his plates, at the close of the Catalogue. But Mr. Astle, in his Origin and Progress of Writing, has presented a specimen of this MS. in his third plate, (1st edit. p. 71,) made while the writing was in its original state, and before the parchment was contracted by the fire; adding that the MS. contained one hundred and sixty-five folia, and two hundred and fifty most curious paintings, twenty-one of which were engraven by the Society of Antiquaries of London. It is said to have belonged to Origen. See Casley, p. ix. and Astle, p. 71. However, it has certainly been

considered the oldest Greek MS. not only in England, but in Europe.

P. 151. [H] "*that MS. of St. Paul's Epistles in Emmanuel College.*" Collated in the Polyglot. See Bib. Polygl. vol. vi. *Variantes Lectiones Græcæ Nov, Test.* "Codex præstans ob antiquitatem, minutis characteribus descriptus." Walton. "A 1 Cor. xi. 7. ad xv. 56. est mutilus; item ab Heb. xi. 27. ad finem Epistolæ; deest præteræà primum caput prioris Petri, quartum primæ Joannis, ejusdem secunda tota ac tertia cum Epistolæ Judæ." Wetstein.

P. 156. [I] "*Prolegom.* vi. *De Variis Lectionibus.*" See the note H. pp. 316, et seq.

P. 180. [K] "*the Arabic Translation.*" See Prof. Ammon's notes upon Ernesti: "Collectiones adcuratæ Versionum Arabicarum cum discrimine ætatis institutæ *nondum exstant.* Vid. Storrius de Evangeliis Arabicis, Tubing. 1775, &c." Ernesti Inst. Interp. N. T. edit. 1809, p. 227. "We know not of any more ancient Translation of the Bible into the Arabic language, than one that was made by Saadias Gaon, a Jew of Babylon, about A. D. 900. But there have been several Translations made since, into that language, both by Jews and Christians. The Eastern Christians have, I think, all of them, some Arabic Translation of the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, made for the use of their people, since that became the vulgar language amongst them. These are mostly made from the Septuagint, or from the Syriac, and are neither very ancient, or of any considerable authority. The best use to be made of them is, that they may serve to illustrate some difficult passages. Among the Arabic Translations, made by Christians, there is one printed in the Polyglots both

of Paris and London. Both the author, and the time when it was writ, are uncertain." Brett on the Ancient Versions of the Bible, 2d. edit. p. 130.

P. 185. [L] "*the Syriac Translation.*" See what Dr. Walton presently says of the *simple edition*, as it is called, of this Version, and also of Bootius; and then compare the following observations of Cappellus and his commentator. "Unde nobis certò probabit, [Bootius,] eam *suam sibi ab initio habuisse Translationem, ex ipsis Hebraicis factam?* An, quia jam talis exstat Versio quædam Syriaca, quæ magis videtur ex Hebræo quàm ex Græco τῶν LXX. facta? Esto talis ea sit, unde nobis demonstrabit Bootius, hodiernam istam statim ab initio fuisse, ac non quarto aut quinto post Christum seculo exortam esse, &c." Here the commentator interposes: "Utrumque hoc falsum est. BOOTIUS quidèm sequutus fabulosas Syrorum narrationes de antiquitate Versionis Syriacæ *simplicis*, ut vulgò vocant, quæ inserta est Bibliis Polyglottis Parisiensibus et Londinensibus, sic errabat, ut eam ad ætatem Christi et Apostolorum referret. CAPPELLUS autem ignorabat, præter illam seculo post Christum natum quarto antiquiorem, quæ ex Hebræo expressa est, verùm ita, ut aut ipsi auctores ejus passim aberrantes ab Hebræo sequerentur Versionem Græcam, aut post hos alii (conf. J. D. Michaelis Biblioth. Orient. P. xviii. p. 180) illam ex hac interpolarent, exstare alias Versiones Syriacas recentiores, è Versione Græca ductas, sed, si particulas quasdam nostra ætate in lucem prolatas exceperis, nondum editas, de quibus diligentèr disserit J. G. Eichorn, &c." Scharfenberg, in L. Capp. Critica Sacra, vol. 3. 537. "Causa traditionis de antiquitate hujus Versionis adeò remota, vi-

detur quærenda esse in defectu testimoniorum historicorum, quo tempora Origeni proxima non laborant. Neque tamen prorsus destituuntur testimoniis historicis, qui originem ejus in fine seculi I. aut initiis II. ponunt, quæ legi possunt apud sententiæ hujus defensores, POCOCKIUM *in Præf. ad Comment. in Joelem, et* WALTONUM *Prolegom.* xiii." Dathe, Præf. in Psalt. Syriacum, Hal. 1768. p. xxiii. "Versio ipsa adpellatur *simplex, literalis;* et jam ante schisma Eutychianum et Nestorianum, fortè sec. II. facta est." Prof. Ammon, Not. in Ernesti, &c. p. 222. Such are the opinions of foreign critics upon the Syriac Version. That this Version was made in the second, or between the second and fourth century, has indeed in later times been the general opinion. I will add the judicious and valuable observation upon it only of one of our own countrymen. "The language most commonly used among the Christians of the East, next to the Greek, is the Syriac. It is properly a dialect of the ancient Chaldee, which the learned divide into different dialects; 1. into that of Babylon, which is the Chaldean language in its purity; 2. into that of Jerusalem, which is what was used by the Jews after their return from their Captivity at Babylon; 3. into that of Antiochia, which was used by the Christians of Comagena, and some other provinces bordering upon Syria, when this was the native language of the country. This last is that which is now more particularly called the Syriac language. And into this language were both the Old and New Testament translated; if not before the death of St. John the Apostle, yet certainly very soon after. And the learned, who have examined this Version, and compared it with the Original both of the Old and

New Testament, tell us, that of all the ancient Versions, which are now consulted by Christians for the better understanding the Holy Scriptures, as well of the New Testament as of the Old, *none can better serve this end than this Old Syriac Version, when carefully consulted and well understood.* And to this purpose the very nature of the language assists much; for it having been the mother tongue of those who wrote the New Testament, and a dialect of that in which the Old was first given to us, many things of both are more happily expressed in this Version than can well be done in any other language." Brett on the Ancient Versions of the Bible, 2d. ed. pp. 127, 128.

P. 188. [M] "*That Cambridge MS.*" See the Preface to the *Variantes in Syriaca Versione Vet. Test. Lectiones*, by Dr. Herbert Thorndike, in the sixth volume of Dr. Walton's Polyglot.

P. 189. [N] See the very valuable Preface of Castell, prefixed to a collation of the Samaritan Pentateuch, in the sixth volume of Dr. Walton's Polyglot; entitled, EDM. CASTELLI, S. T. B. *Præfatio de Animadversionum Samariticarum in totum Pentateuchum, ab eo collectarum, scopo atque usu.* Dr. Walton's Polyglot gives also the Samaritan version, that is, in the language commonly spoken among the Samaritans, very different, in consequence of corruption by foreign innovations, from the Samaritan Pentateuch itself, which is Hebrew in Samaritan characters. The sense of both is nearly the same; and one Latin version is found in the Polyglot for both, with occasional notes of variation at the bottom of the column. See more of the Samaritan Pentateuch, in bishop Marsh's Theol. Lectures, P. II. Lect. x. pp. 86, et seq. and Lect. xi.

pp. 93, et seq. Among the adversaries of the Samaritan Pentateuch, one has endeavoured to degrade the Latin version, of which I have just spoken, not without a subsequent very ill-judged reflection upon the "*doctissimi Angli*," as he calls them. I will cite a part of his censure: "Ultima causa libri Samaritani negligentèr admodùm habiti ea nobis semper visa est, quòd misera ac nimis jejuna versio Latina Pentateuchi Samaritani alterius, illius scilicet, qui idiomate Samaritano conscriptus est, in utrisque Bibliis Polyglottis, [Paris. et Londin.] *quæ profectò parum desiderii, librum ipsum propiùs pernoscendi, in eruditorum animis excitare poterat!*" Exercitationes Historico-Criticæ in utrumque Samaritanum Pentateuchum: auctore F. J. Schwarzio, 4to. Wittembergæ, 1756." Præf. p. vi. Now the very reason, which Professor Schwarz assigns as uninviting to further investigation, would, to a scholar of any spirit, one should think, be that which would not only invite, but urge him on, to a *nearer acquaintance with the original*; unless, indeed, Professor Schwarz was the only *eruditus* competent to have made such a discovery of defect in the version adopted both by Morinus and Walton; and unless at his appalling words the whole body of the *eruditi* were then only to be awakened as to Samaritan research, or to be for ever fallen. I must refer the reader upon the subject of the Samaritan Pentateuch to Walton's own excellent Prolegomena, cap. xi. And for the rescue of this Pentateuch from the charges of its adversaries, with other valuable remarks upon it, to bishop Marsh's Theological Lectures, L. xii. pp. 141, et seq.

P. 193. [O] "*which belonged to one of their priests*

in Damascus." See the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, pp. 185, et seq.

P. 194. [P] "*that have laid aside the English Liturgy.*" See the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, p. 137.

P. 196. [Q] "*the Chaldee Paraphrase.*" See the address to the reader by Mr. Samuel Clarke, one of Dr. Walton's principal assistants, prefixed to his *Variæ Lectiones et Observationes in Chaldaicam Paraphrasin*, in the sixth volume of the Polyglot; and also Dr. Walton's original description of his intended edition, Mem. p. 38.

P. 197. [R] "*the Vulgar Latin.*" Dr. Walton says, that he thought this version should have felt the displeasure of his adversary most, *because so magnified by the Church of Rome.* I will subjoin a very judicious observation upon this point. "Latina S. Scripturæ Versio, quæ inde ab Hieronymi ætate *Communis* seu *Vulgata* dici consuevit, *nimio, quod Pontificii illi statuunt, pretio*, apud nostrates ferè in contemptum est adducta. Sed linguæ Hebraicæ, quæ diu jam in consuetudine esse desiit, usum eam haud vulgarem præstare, justi rerum æstimatores concedunt omnes atque fatentur. Etenim ut malè interdum Hebraica Latinè converterit, et vocabulis eos subjecerit sensus, qui contexto sermoni minùs sint accomodati; tamen ipso sæpius errore prodest, et verborum Hebraicorum eas significationes indicat, quas alioquin ægrè essemus cogniturі." E. A. Frommanni, Theol. Doct. Opusc. Philolog. Ceb. 1770, vol. 1. p. 177.

P. 198. [S] "*the Septuagint.*" Dr. Brett, in his Dissertation on the Ancient Versions of the Bible

affords a fine comment on this text of Walton, 2d. edit. pp. 44, et seq. and pp. 67, et seq.

P. 201. [T] "*the Ethiopic.*" Ernesti thus describes the Ethiopic Version of the New Testament. "Æthiopicam commemorare creditur Chrysostomus, in Homil. in Jo. 2. Itaque ea, quæ nunc exstat, ipso antiquior putatur. Sed ex illo loco nihil certi potest colligi. Æthiopes quidèm S. Frumentio tribuunt, cujus ætas in Constantini M. tempora incidit. Eam è Græco factam defendit cel. Michaelis de Var. Lect. N. T. §. 24, 25. Nam quòd pluribus locis cum Latino consentit, causa esse potest hæc, quòd ea à Tessa Tzione, monasterii Æthiopici monacho, Romæ 1548-9, edita est è Codice lacunoso, et à Latino suppleta et interpolata, adjuvante Mariano Victorio Reatino, et alio perito. Repetita in Polyglottis Lond. etiam vitiosior facta est." Inst. Interpr. N. T. P. III. c. iv. §. 7. No better Ethiopic Version could be procured, when Dr. Walton published the Polyglot. This Version is generally believed to have been made in the fourth century. Of other parts of the Sacred Writings in the Ethiopic Tongue, and printed in the London Polyglot, see the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, pp. 78, 167, 171, 250. I refer the reader also to Professor Bode's *Evangelium secundum Matthæum ex Versione Æthiopici Interpretis in Bibliis Polyglottis Anglicanis editum*, &c. Hal. 1749; to his *Novum Testamentum*, from the same Version, afterwards published; and to his *Fragmenta Vet. Test. ex Vers. Æthiop. Interpr. et alia quædam Opuscula Æthiop. ex Æthiop. ling. in Lat.* 1756.

Ibid. [U] "*the Persian.*" See what is said of the Persian Pentateuch, Memoirs of Dr. Walton, pp. 52,

77, 226. and of the Gospels, ibid. pp. 78, 281. And particularly the elaborate and curious Preface of the oriental critic named in the preceding note, to his *Evangelium secundum Matthæum ex Versione Persici Interpretis in Bibliis Polyglottis Anglicanis editum: Ex Persico idiomate in Latinum transtulit, simulque de Persica IV. Evangeliorum Versione generatim præfatus est C. A.* Bodius, 1750. It may gratify the oriental scholar to be informed that, in the Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, a Copy of the four Gospels in the Persian language is preserved; and is thus described by the late Sir William Jones: "It is written in a hand uncommonly bold and clear: in one or two of the alternate pages the Persian is expressed in European letters, and, by the pronunciation of the words, I should suppose that the book was written in India, where, it is to be wished, that the Persian Gospels were more common."

P. 203. [W] "*what our Sectaries have cried down,*" Compare the conclusion of Dr. Walton's *Considerator considered;* and see the Memoirs of his Life and Writings, p. 137.

P. 207. [X] "*hath been long disputed.*" See what is before said in the note H, p. 320, on the Hebrew points.

P. 212. [Y] "*as is shewed Prolegom.* ii." It should be added, from the sixth to the twelfth section.

P. 213. [Z] "*that ancient Greek MS. of Cardinal Barberini's.*" Collated in the sixth volume of Dr. Walton's Polyglot, pp. 131—137.

P. 224. [A] "*he first got the knowledge of the Arabic tongue.*" He appears to have been much indebted also for this kind of knowledge to our learned countryman, William Bedwell, one of our authorized

Translators of the Bible. See the Memoirs of Dr. Walton, p. 106.

P. 235. [B] "*some learned men of good note.*" Most of the Protestants at the time espoused the cause of Buxtorf.

P. 286. [C] "*this question is handled at large, Proleg.* iii. *sect.* 29—38." To what is there discussed may be added some observations of later and very discerning critics upon a subject so important, in unison or at variance with Dr. Walton, or in moderation of the dispute. "The ancient Hebrew alphabet was not written in the present Hebrew character, but in a letter pretty much the same as the present Samaritan. Buxtorf and Lightfoot were not of this opinion; but it has been abundantly proved by Scaliger, Casaubon, Grotius, Vossius, Bochart, Father Morin, Brerewood, Cappellus, and Walton. Bishop Walton has proved it, beyond contradiction, from some ancient Jerusalem coins, called *shekels*. The Rabbins, Talmudists, Christian Fathers, Origen, and St. Jerom, all believed that there had been a change of the Hebrew letters. St. Jerom asserts it very expressly. Spanheim and Dr. Allix took the other side of the question; but they have answered only a small part of the arguments against them. This change of the Hebrew letters was made by Ezra, after the rebuilding of the Temple, when he wrote out a new Copy of the Law." Shuckford, Connection of Sacred and Profane History, vol. 1. pp. 254, 255. Compare the sixth and following sections of this chapter of Dr. Walton's Considerator. "In controversia illa, quæ complurium virorum doctorum calamos exercuit, utrum literæ Hebræorum hodiernæ, quæ quadratæ vocantur, an Samaritanæ an-

tiquæ sint, WALTONUS eorum partibus accedit, qui pro his pugnant. Utraque sententia non destituitur rationibus, aliis gravioribus, aliis levioribus. Qui eas brevitèr et summatim collectas legere velit, evolvat CARPZOVIUM in Critica S. cap. v. sect. vi. p. 225, seqq. ubi utriusque sententiæ defensores, recentiores etiam, qui post WALTONUM in hac palæstra decertarunt, larga manu citatos inveniet. Sed fuerunt etiam, qui hanc controversiam parùm momentosam judicarent. In quibus est GUSSETIUS, qui sub finem dissertationis Lexico suo præmissæ dicit; *inanem esse suspicionem terrori panico similem, quæ ex illa literarum commutatione integritati Codicis Sacri aliquid derogari vereatur: Idem prorsùs evenisse in literis Græcis et Latinis;* CAPITALES, *quæ vocantur, permutatas esse in librorum descriptione cum* VERSALIBUS, *neque quemquam judicare propterea libros Græcos et Latinos magìs mendosos ad nos venisse:* Et tandem addit, *idem fortè in hac controversia evenisse, quod in adagio est περὶ κακῆς στρεψοδικεῖν; fortè enim,* inquit, *Mosaicæ literarum figuræ nec hæ nec illæ erant, sed diversæ quædam, ex quibus alii has quadratas sensim finxerunt amore simplicitatis, alii Samaritanas, quærentes ex multiplicitate flexuum vel ornamentum vel distinctionem majorem.* Idem ferè in mentem venit DEYLINGIO, qui in Observatt. S. P. III. Obs. XXV. §. 20. dicit, *sibi nec quadratas Hebræorum literas quales nunc in usu sunt, nec Samaritanas, antiquissimas et primævas videri, propter inconstantiam in scribendo et mutabilitatem, cui omnium linguarum literæ sint obnoxiæ.* Legerat fortè idem in R. SIMONIS Hist. Crit. V. T. lib. i. cap. 13. p. 79. cujus verba hæc sunt: *Je remarquerai seulement, qu'une bonne par-*

tie des caracteres Samaritains et des Caldéens, qu'on nomme aujourdhui Hebreux, semblent avoir été les memes dans leur origine, mais qu'il leur est arrivé, ce qui arrive d'ordinaire aux autres langues, dont les caracteres changent avec le tems et quand elles passent d'un lieu en un autre. Atque huic sententiæ ego quoque accedere nullus dubito, non solùm propter allatas rationes, sed etiam propter summam difficultatem, qua ejusmodi solennis quasi literarum antiquarum abrogatio, et novarum surrogatio, inter Judæos per tot regiones dispersos perficienda fuisset. Unde verò, dicat aliquis, constans illa antiquitatis traditio, Judæorum, Hieronymi, Eusebii, de Esra mutatæ Samaritice Scripturæ in Assyriacam seu Chaldaicam auctore? Ad hanc objectionem non deest, quod respondeam. Venit illa traditio à Judæis mendacibus, qui omnibus suis institutis divinam solent originem affingere, atque inprimis Esram eorum auctorem jactare ad majorem eis fidem conciliandam atque auctoritatem. Non mirum igitur videri debet, HIERONYMUM hac de mutatione loqui tanquam de re certa et fidei indubitatæ, cùm totus, quoad linguæ Hebreæ cognitionem, penderet ab ore Judæi sui magistri Tiberiensis. Non temerè à me hujus impudentiæ Judæos accusari, testis est famosa illa Synagoga Magna, cujus præsidem etiam Esram fuisse mentiuntur, à quo, et centum et viginti ejus assessoribus, omnia, quæ ad rem sacram pertinent, ordinata fuerunt et instituta. Sed dudum hoc commentum explosum est adeò ab eis, qui in admittendis Judæorum traditionibus minimè sunt difficiles. Hanc MEDIAM QUASI VIAM, ad devitandas in alterutram partem aberrationes, ingressus etiam est SCHULTENSIUS in Instit. Ling. Hebr. p. 15, seqq. præ aliis dig-

nus, qui de HOC ARGUMENTO legatur." Dathe, in Prolegom. Walton. pp. xxvii, xxviii, xxix. Dathe is again employed in refuting the idea of Esdras or Ezra (for the name is the same) setting forth a copy or canon of Holy Writ, pp. xxxiii, xxxiv. But besides this disagreement with Dr. Walton in the chapter before us, and not allowing the authority of modern Jewish testimony that Ezra laid down any rules at all, Dathe objects to another assertion of Dr. Walton respecting the Hebrew language, which may here be properly noticed, as it also finely cautions the reader against another modern Jewish notion. "Laudes linguæ Hebrææ recensuit WALTONUS, quas ego quoque lubentèr ei tribuam, modò omittatur ex eis *sanctitas*, quæ ei propter peculiares rationes præ omnibus aliis linguis propria sit. Quamvis enim meritò dignitas eximia et principatus quidam huic linguæ concedendus sit, quòd primæva est omniumque aliarum mater, tamen sanctam eam dicere nolim ex ratione à WALTONO allata; *quòd divina religionis mysteria hac lingua tradita sunt*. Etenim Novi Testamenti libri longè pleniori Dei cognitione et perfectiore nos instruunt, cultum Deo præstandum longè faciliorem præscribunt, de æterna felicitati homini per et propter Christum expectanda longè clarius et apertius loquuntur, quàm illi Veteris Testamenti Hebraicè scripti. Græca igitur lingua potius sancta et sanctissima esset dicenda, si, propter res sanctas lingua aliqua enunciatas et scriptas, ea sancta dici meretur. Nimirum hæc est opinio ista Judaica, excogitata ab hac gente in contemptum omnium aliarum nationum, et inprimis in contumeliam religionis Christianæ. Satis nota est gentis Judaicæ superbia et fastus, quo sese omnibus aliis gentibus longè

præstantiorem esse jactat. Non mirum igitur, si et majorum suorum linguam unicè aptam esse contendunt tradendis religionis mysteriis; ita enim simul libros Christianos sanctissimos, et dogmata quæ tradunt, unà cum auctore eorum divino, rejiciunt, contemnunt, conviciantur. Hinc non satis cautè admissum esse judico ex Judaismo *illam linguæ Hebrææ sanctitatem*, et parum peritè defensam à Christianis philologis plerisque contra eos, qui eam in dubiam vocarent. Equidem non dubito, quin boni illi viri istam sententiam ea qua digna est detestatione rejecissent, si anguem in herba latentem agnovissent. Sed pia illa superstitio, qua à Judæis præceptoribus suis erga linguam Hebræam imbuti fuerunt, effecit, ut nihil de maligno Judæorum consilio in his laudibus, quas linguæ Hebrææ tribuerent, suspicarentur. Sed primus, quantum scio, illud detexit, et pro merito cum indignatione rejecit, A. SCHULTENSIUS in Præf. Comm. ad Proverbia Salomonis. Eundem deinde errorem, et plures alios, qui ex illo provenerunt, castigavit FROMMANNUS in Dissertatione *de opinata linguæ Hebrææ sanctitate fœcunda errorum matre.*" Dathe, in Proleg. pp. xxiv, xxv. The dissertation of Frommannus is extremely curious and important; and is divided into the following discussions, after delivering in section 1. some remarks upon the title of the sanctity in question. Sect. 2. "Nomen linguæ sanctæ quod initium habuerit, docetur." Sect. 3. "Causæ hujus appellationis derivantur ex Judæorum superbia et inimico in Evang. animo." Sect. 4. "Sanctitas linguæ Heb. à Christianis philologis nonnullis imprudenter approbata. Sect. 5. "Momentum opinionis de sanctitate linguæ Heb." Sect. 6. "Declarantur errores ab hac opinione nati,

in judicanda natura ling. Heb. universè." Sect. 7. "Errores in historia ling. Heb." Sect. 8. "Errores in grammatica ling Heb. et quidèm ratione literarum Hebraicarum." Sect. 9. "Errores grammatici ratione significationum vocum Heb. constituendarum." Sect. 10. "Errores grammatici ratione universæ dicendi formæ Heb."

Reverting to the former part of this note, the observation of bishop Marsh may here close the subject, that is, the antiquity of the Hebrew letters; the latest and most useful work upon which, he says, is *Josephi Dobrowsky de antiquis Hebræorum characteribus Dissertatio, Pragæ.* 1783. "This tract contains in a short compass a perspicuous statement of all the arguments both for, and against, the antiquity of the Hebrew letters; and the conclusion which the author deduces is, that *not the Hebrew, but that the Samaritan was the ancient alphabet of the Jews.* That the present Hebrew or Chaldee character was *not* used by the Jews before the Babylonish captivity is an opinion, which is now almost universally received, and the truth of it seems no longer disputable. But it is still a question whether the Samaritan letters, *in the form in which we now find them in Manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch,* were the letters used by the Jews before the Babylonish Captivity." Theol. Lect. P. II. p. 135. I venture to add to that which respects the biblical text, already stated in this long note, the following sound and masterly remarks. "If God has graciously given us his revealed word, let us not repine that he does not put it out of our power to abuse it, but has given it on precisely the same conditions as all his other bounties. Nor let us hastily

suppose that the evil of a corrupted text is irremediable, or that it impairs the authority of Scripture. We see in the natural world, that the effects of guilt in one age may be counteracted by the virtues of another. So it is with the Bible. The marginal notes and the vowel system have done much towards restoring the text, and facilitating the interpretation, of the Old Testament; and our gratitude is therefore due to the Great Synagogue of Ezra, the Tiberian Masorites, or whoever else were their authors. The labours of Mill and Griesbach have also been invaluable in correcting the text of the New Testam et. These are indeed cheering and glorious monuments of the possibility of recovering the sacred book from its corruptions." Whittaker's Historical and Critical Enquiry into the Interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, 1819. p. 177.

P. 289. [D] "*in the same Prolegomena.*" Namely, sect. 30.

P. 291. [E] "*in the same Prolegomena.*" Namely, sect. 31.

P. 299. [F] "*as Liber Enochi, in Dr. Dee, written by direction of his spirits!*" It is worth noting of this strange person, that "Meredith Lloyd asserted, that John Dee's *printed book of spirits* was not above the third part of what was writ." Aubrey's Anecdotes, vol. 2. p. 311. And yet a folio, respecting the operations of them and Dr. Dee, was published by Meric Casaubon!

P. 304. [G] "*entreating the reader, who desires more full satisfaction, to have recourse to the Prolegomena and Appendix themselves.*" It may be useful then to detail the component parts of these important

productions, the Prolegomena and Appendix to Dr. Walton's Polyglot Bible.

PROLEGOMENA.

I. De linguarum natura, origine, divisione, numero, mutationibus, et usu.

II. De literis, sive characteribus, ipsarum usu mirabili, origine et inventione prima, et diversitate in linguis præcipuis.

III. De lingua Hebraica, ejus antiquitate, conservatione, mutatione, præstantia et usu, characteribus antiquis, punctisque vocalibus, et accentibus.

IV. De Bibliorum Editionibus præcipuis.

V. De Bibliorum Versionibus.

VI. De Variantibus in Scriptura Lectionibus.

VII. De Textuum Originalium integritate et auctoritate.

VIII. De Masora, Keri et Ketib, Variis Lectionibus Orientalium et Occidentalium, Ben Ascher et Ben Naphtali; et de Cabala.

IX. De Versione Græca LXXII. Interpretum, aliisque Græcis Versionibus.

X. De Versione Vulgata Latina.

XI. De Pentateucho Samaritano, ejusque Versionibus.

XII. De lingua Chaldaica, et Versionibus Chaldaicis.

XIII. De lingua Syriaca, et Versionibus Syriacis.

XIV. De lingua Arabica, et Versionibus Arabicis.

XV. De lingua Æthiopica, et Versionibus Æthiopicis.

XVI. De lingua Persica, et Versionibus Persicis.

APPENDIX.

I. Tractatus de Codicum Hebræorum Variis Lectionibus, quæ Keri et Ketib dicuntur; eorum origine, numero, &c. Item de Variantibus Lectionibus Orientalium et Occidentalium, Ben Ascher et Ben Naphtali, cum singularum catalogis, parascharum item et haphtararum tabulis.

II. Chaldaicæ Paraphraseως Editionis nostræ cum illâ in Bibliis Regiis Collatio, ubi discrepantiæ annotantur, cum annotationibus et observationibus doctissimis.

III. Syriacæ Versionis Vet. Test. cum aliis vetust. Codd. Syr. MSS. Usserianis, Pocockiano, et Cantabrigiensi, Collatio, cum notis et observationibus circa loca variantia.

IV. Pentateuchus Samaritanus cum Textu Hebraico collatus, discrepantiæ omnes collectæ, loca etiam in quibus Text. Samar. cum Versione τῶν ὁ convenit, utrumque verò ab Heb. differt.

V. Annotationes et Observationes doctissimæ ad Textum et Versionem Samarit. spectantes.

VI. Notæ et observationes doctissimæ in Psalmos, Cantic. Canticorum, et Nov. Test. Versionis Æthiopicæ.

VII. Annotationes in Pentateuchum Persicum, et in Quatuor Evangelia Persica.

VIII. Arabica Versio Pentat. cum R. Saadiæ Versione, tàm quæ in Codd. MSS. quàm quæ in Bibliis Constantinopolitanis extat, collata.

IX. Flam. Nobilii Notæ in Græc. LXXII. Editionem Romanam, in quibus ex antiquis Ecclesiæ scriptoribus, et libris tàm MSS. quàm impressis, Heb.

Græc. Samarit. Lat. Syr. Chald. &c. textus explicatur vel confirmatur; quibus varia à Nobiliò prætermissa ex scholiis Romanis, Jo. Drusio, et aliis, vel Latinè tantùm ab ipso ex Græcis scriptoribus citata, ipsis scriptorum verbis adductis, adjecimus.

X. Editio Romana LXXII. Interpretum cum aliis Editionibus hodiernis, Veneta et Complutensi, ex quibus reliquæ profluxerunt, et cum quibusdam MSS. exemplaribus collata; omniaque loca variantia collecta.

XI. Ejusdem Collatio cum aliis MSS. vetustissimis, Cottoniano per Genesin, Cantabrigiensi per libros Chronicorum, Rupifucaldiano per Esaiam, Card. Barberini per Minores Prophetas.

XII. Andr. Masii Notæ in Josuam cum asteriscis, obelis, lemniscis, hypolemniscis, &c. ex vetustiss. exemplari Syriaco, ante mille annos exarato, collectæ.

XIII. Lovaniensium Theologorum Collationes Vulg. Lat. Vet. Test. cum aliis exemplaribus, item cum Textu Hebr. Versionibus Chald. Græc. Syr. et Latinis Ecclesiæ Patribus.

XIV. Patricii Junii Annotationes quas paraverat ad MS. Alexandrini Editionem, in quibus Codicem illum antiquiss. cum Textu Hebr. et veteribus Ecclesiæ scriptoribus, aliisque Græcis Editionibus, confert.

XV. Ex viri summi Hugonis Grotii Annotatis in universam Scripturam Excerpta de Locis Variantibus, cum ejusdem de singulis judicio.

XVI. Variæ Lectiones Græcæ N. Test. tàm quas collegerat Rob. Stephanus ex XVI. Codicibus MSS. quàm ex plurimis aliis vetustissimis exemplaribus collectæ, et in unum corpus digestæ.

XVII. Lucæ Brugensis libelli duo de Græcis et Latinis Varietatibus Evangeliorum, et Lovan. Theo-

log. Collationes Vulg. Lat. Nov. Test. cum Textu Græc. Syr. et Latinis scriptoribus.

XVIII. In Syriacam Versionem N. Test. Notæ Mart. Trostii, ex variis Codicibus collectæ, cum aliis quibusdam à nobis nuper adjectis.

XIX. Propriorum nominum, Hebraicorum, Græcorum, Chaldaicorum, explicatio.

XX. Rerum et verborum per totam Scripturam Index, secundum libros, capita, et versus.

To this description of a never-failing theological and critical treasury, I will only add the concluding eulogium of Dathe upon the Prolegomena, as published in a separte form; earnestly recommending it to the attention of every biblical and oriental student. "Videor mihi jam satisfecisse officio præfandi libro, cujus lectionem non possum non philologiæ S. studiosis vehementèr commendare, licet hinc inde quædam sint, quæ post auctoris tempora accuratius sunt excussa, aut plenius tractata. *Habebunt sanè tirones in hoc libro compendium utilissimum, ex quo omnium eorum, quæ ad Criticam S. utriusque Testamenti pertinent, notitiam sibi acquirere possunt, quam deinde adjuncta recentiorum scriptorum lectione eo felicius augebunt.* QUOD UT A MULTIS FIAT, IN REI CHRISTIANÆ UTILITATEM ETIAM ATQUE ETIAM OPTO."

INDEX.

INDEX

OF

PRINCIPAL PERSONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES.

(The first Figures denote the Volumes; the second, the Pages.)

A.

Abbot, George. His Comment upon Jonah, with Hebrew criticisms, I. 119. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible, ibid.

Adams, Sir Thomas. Founder of an Arabic Professorship at Cambridge. I. 236. Letter from the Heads of Colleges at Cambridge to him. I. 236, 237. His high reputation, I. 237. Published at his cost Mr. Wheelock's Persian Gospels. I. 241.

Additions to the London Polyglot. Proposals of several. I. 321, et seq. by Mr. Clarke. I. 321. by Father Simon. I. 322. by Dr. Mawer. I. 326. by Mr. Peatt. I. 332. by Dr. A. Clarke. I. 334.

Afternoon Preachers. Another name for Lecturers in the time of the Great Rebellion. I. 17. What they were. ibid. Why unacceptable to Dr. Walton. I. 16, 17.

Aglionby, John. An excellent linguist. I. 122. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Ainsworth, Henry. His Oriental learning. I. 124. Blamed by Frommannus. ibid.

Alexandrian MS. Gr. of the Bible. Intended to be collated and published by Dr. Tho. Smith. I. 256. The New Testament actually published by D. Woide. ibid. The Old Testament now passing through the press under the care of the very learned and vigilant Mr. Baber. ibid. and II. 330. Examined by Mr. Huish, one of Dr. Walton's assistants. I. 272. Declared by Dr. Bentley to have been collated by Huish with great exactness. I. 273. Intended to be collated and published by P. Young. I. 287. Further account of this MS. II. 148, 330.

Alley, Bishop. Author of a Hebrew Grammar I. 99.

Andrewes, Bishop. A great linguist. I. 102. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. His scriptural criticism. I. 103.

Apocryphal Books. Different opinions upon the English Translation of them. I. 118. Specimen of Dr. Ward's translation of the past assigned to him. I. 119.

Appendix to the London Polyglot. No private or new opinions in them. II. 26, 27. Contents of it described. II. 349.

Arabic Versions of Scripture. II. 180, 199, 333, 334.

Arnald, Mr. Inaccurately places, in the Preface to his Critical Commentary on the Book of Wisdom, Dr. Duport, the Greek Professor, as one of the Translators of the Apocryphal Books. I. 118, 119.

Articles exhibited against Dr. Walton. Founded on falsehood. I. 18.

Assemblies of People Very judicious remarks of Lord Digby upon such as are irregular and tumultuous. I. 13.

Authorized English Translation of the Bible. Perspicuity

of the language, opposed to modern alterations of it. I. 132. No necessity for a new Translation. I. 134, 135.

B.

Bacon, Lord. Poems on his death. I. 302.

Baker, Samuel. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 309. Chaplain to Bishop Juxon. ibid. Imprisoned and deprived of his preferments in the Great Rebellion. I. 310.

Baro, Peter. His Prelections upon Jonah. I. 113. Hebrew criticisms in the work. ibid.

Basmurico-Coptica Fragmenta Vet. et Nov. Test. Noticed. I. 171.

Baxter, Richard. His account of some particulars at the Savoy Conference. I. 136. Defends his use of the word *nation*. I. 297. Laments being deceived, as he says, by Archbishop Sterne's promising countenance. I. 297, 298.

Beckius, M. F. His publication of the Targum upon the Chronicles. I. 324, 325.

Bedell, Bishop. A profound Hebrew scholar. I. 124.

Bedwell, William. The principal Arabic scholar of his time. I. 106. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Taught Pocock. ibid. And Erpenius. ibid. Made collections of Eastern learning. I. 107. Assisted the studies of Dr. Lightfoot. ibid.

Bentham, Bishop. Skilled in the Hebrew language. I. 100.

Bentley, Dr. Richard. Declares the Alexandrian MS. to have been collated by Mr. Huish with great exactness. I. 273.

Beza, Theodore. His MS. Codex N. T. II. 148, 331.

Bible. See *Polyglot and Translation*.

Bilson, Bishop. A master of languages. I. 122. The reviewer of our authorized Translation of the Bible. ibid.

Bodley, Sir Thomas. An Oriental scholar. I. 123.

Bois, John. An eminent Hebrew as well as Greek scholar. I. 121. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. His Collation of the Evangelists and Acts. ibid. Fine biblical and classical criticism displayed in that book. I. 121, 122.

Books. None free from opposition. II. 8.

Bootius, or *Boate*, Arnold. His opinion of the projected London Polyglot. I. 60, 61. Censured by Cappellus. I. 61. Sends his treatise against Cappellus to Archbishop Usher. I. 198. Writes of proceeding further in his rash warfare. I. 200. Gently replied to by Archbishop Usher. I. 201. Not satisfied with Archbishop Usher's moderation, in his letter to Cappel, upon the subject of the controversy between them. I. 202.

Brett, Richard. Skilled and versed to a criticism in Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic, and Ethiopic. I. 117. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Translator also of some Greek historical fragments into Latin, to which he prefixed verses in Oriental languages. I. 114.

Broughton, Hugh. His impotent attack upon the received English Version of the Bible. I. 92. His Oriental learning. I. 124. Want of judgment. ibid. Blamed by Frommannus. ibid.

Byng, Andrew. Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. I. 117. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

C.

Caius College, Cambridge. Hebrew MS. belonging to it. II. 329.

Calvin, John. Dangerous political notions maintained by him. I. 73, 74.

Calvinistical Tenets disclaimed by Archbishop Usher. I. 203, et seq.

Cappellus, or *Cappel*, Lewis. His controversy with Arnold Bootius, or Boate. I. 61, 200, 201. With Buxtorf. I. 200. II. 321. Receives from Archbishop Usher his famous letter upon this subject. I. 202. His opinion of the Hebrew points. II. 320, et seq.

Casaubon, Meric. Dr. Walton's acknowledgment of intended service from him. I. 313. His affecting letter to Archbishop Usher relating to his distress, and to his MSS. in the Great Rebellion. I. 314. Relieved by Selden. ibid.

Castell, Edmund. Appointed to consider of a new English Version of the Bible. I. 90. Agrees that our authorized Version is the best of any of the Translations. I. 91, 92. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 163. Some account of him and his works. I. 163, et seq. Slow sale of his Lexicon. I. 174. Destruction of many copies. ibid. Observations on the publication of the two volumes of the Lexicon. I. 174, 175. His benefactors. I. 175. His property. I. 176 His bequests. ibid. His curious copy of Schindler, with his MSS. notes in Sidney College Library. I. 176, 177. Author of poems, entitled Sol Angliæ, &c. I. 177. And of an Oration upon the Arabic Language. I. 177, 178. Remarks upon his Lexicon. I. 179. His preferments. I. 164. His labours and losses. I. 164, 165, 168, 169. Pious wishes expressed in behalf of him. I. 166. Worked at the Polyglott sixteen or eighteen hours a day. I. 167. Speaks of Dr. Walton's indefatigable diligence. ibid. Considers his own generosity slighted. I. 168. Mentions the sums he had expended on his Lexicon. I. 169. Makes his condition known to the king. ibid. His zeal for Oriental

and biblical learning. I. 170, 171. Small returns of aid which recommendatory letters produced for his Lexicon. I. 173,

Cawton, Thomas. A distinguished Oriental scholar and promoter of the Polyglot. I. 318.

Chaderton, Laurence. A great Hebrew scholar. I. 112, 113. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Chaldee Paraphrase. Account of it. II. 296. 338. Defended. II. 296, et seq.

Charles, King, I. Declares against Popish innovations. I. 15. Not the author of the ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ. I. 138, et seq.

Charles, King, II. Accepts the dedication of Dr. Walton's Polyglot. I. 82. Would have aided the progress of it with money, if the means had not been wanting in his exile. ibid.

Cheshire Petition. In behalf of the Liturgy of the Church of England. I. 151, et seq.

Church of England. Assaulted by Romanists and Sectaries. II. 2.

Chronicles. Ancient Greek MS. of the Book of Chronicles. II. 148. 331.

Chylinsky, S. His Lithuanian Translation of the Bible. I. 172. Approbation of it at Oxford. ibid.

Clarke, Samuel. Appointed to consider of a new English Version of the Bible. I. 90. Agrees that the authorized Version is the best of any of the Translations. I. 91, 92. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 243. Inferior only to Pocock in Eastern learning. ibid. Superior beadle of law at Oxford. ibid. His especial services to Dr. Walton. I. 243, 244. His character by Castell. I. 244. His modest letter to Dr. Lightfoot, when the Polyglot was finished. I. 245. Intended to print the Targum upon the Chronicles, from the Cambridge MS. with his own translation. I. 245. Intended an additional

volume, as a supplement to the Polyglot. I. 246. His MSS. in the Bodleian Library. I. 246, 247. His publications. I. 247, 248. His proposed additional volume to the London Polyglot. I. 321, 322.

Clergy of the Church of England. The unmerciful treatment of them by the rebels. I. 295.

Clergy, London. Apply to King Charles I. on the subject of their tithes, with the consequence. I. 5.

Clerke, Richard. Profoundly skilled in Hebrew. I. 104. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Specimens of his criticisms. I. 105.

Codex Claromontanus MS. II. 148. Its age. II. 331.

Cohen de Lara, David. His works noticed. I. 172, 173.

Committees. In the time of the Great Rebellion, assembled to insult and oppress the loyal Clergy. I. 21.

Committee of Reformation. Exert themselves in the University of Oxford, by persecuting those who followed May-Games. I. 277. Break garlands, take away fiddles from musicians, and put morice-dancers to the rout. I. 277, 278.

Communion-Table. Under the east-window, explained by the Canons and Constitutions of 1640. I. 14, 15.

Considerations. (Dr. Owen's.) Published against the London Polyglot. II. 8. What they are. II. 8, 9. Occasion and motives of them. II. 20. Untruth in them. II. ibid. et seq. Sinister ends in them. II. 22. Dangerous assertions in them. II. 24, 25. Groundless fears and jealousies in them. II. 29.

Cooper, Joseph. A fierce enemy of Dr. Walton on the subject of the Hebrew points. II. 315. His vanity in regard to Cappellus, Prideaux, and Walton. ibid.

Cotton, Sir Robert. His Greek MS. of Genesis. II. 149. Account of it. II. 331.

Coverdale, Miles. His skill in Hebrew. I. 98, 99.

Council of State in the time of Cromwell. Not believed to have advanced any money in aid of the Polyglot. I. 59.

Critici Sacri. The paper for the publication of this work exempted by Oliver Cromwell from duty. I. 60.

Cromwell, Oliver. Granted to Dr. Walton an exemption from duty to all the paper for the work. I. 59. Granted the same to the Critici Sacri. I. 60. Wished to extort from Dr. Walton a dedication of the Polyglot. I. 84, 85. Ordered Archbishop Usher to be buried in Westminster Abbey. I. 182. Threw two-thirds of the expence upon the relations of the archbishop, behaving like a paltry undertaker, rather than a liberal public governor. ibid.

Cudworth, Dr. R. Supposed to be an assistant to Dr. Walton. I. 49. Appointed to consider of a new English Version of the Bible. I. 90.

D.

Dakins, Mr. Skilled in the original languages of the Bible. I. 119. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Dathe, J. A. Prefixed, to a republication of Dr. Walton's Prolegomena to the Polyglot, a very valuable Preface. I. 75. Extracts from it. II. 318, et seq. His eulogium upon the Prolegomena. II. 351.

Davies, Bishop. Assisted in translating the Bible from the Original into both the Welch and English tongue. I. 100.

Davis, Sir Thomas. Letters from Aleppo to Archbishop Usher. I. 184, et seq.

Dedication to King Charles II. of the London Polyglot. I. 340, et seq.

Dee, Dr. His book of Spirits. II. 347.

Dering, Sir Edward. His vapid jokes. I. 22.

D'Espagne, Jean. Conts the notice of Cromwell with an attempt to depreciate the authorized English Version of the Bible. I. 89, 90. Title of his work. I. 90.

Digby, Lord George. His memorable speech upon the petition presented by the notorious anarchist, Isaac Pennington, against Church government. I. 12.

Drake, Richard. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 310. Chancellor of the Church of Salisbury. I. 311.

Duport, Dr. James. Mistaken by Mr. Arnald and Dr. Gray as one of our Translators of the Bible. I. 119.

Duport, Dr. John. One of our Translators of the Bible. I. 119.

E.

Editors of the Bible. Calumniated. II. 3. et seq.

Edward, King, VI. Hebrew learning in England during his reign. I. 98, 99.

Elias Bucerus. Written by Bishop Gauden. I. 138, et seq.

Elizabeth, Queen. Hebrew Learning in England during her reign I. 100, et seq. Complimented for her knowledge of Eastern tongues. I. 100.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Codex MS. Epist. S. Pauli. II. 151, 333.

Ephrem Syrus. I. 187, 194.

Erpenius, Thomas. Obliged to W. Bedwell for instruction in the Arabic tongue. I. 106, 107. His printed books, if they had not been previously sold, intended for the public library at Cambridge. I. 193. His manuscripts there. I. 193, 194.

Ethiopic Version. Of the Old and New Testament. I. 327. II. 201, 339.

Etheridge, Dr. A physician, and eminent Hebrician. I. 100.

Evangelical Preachers. Distinctive expression adopted by the puritanical master of a college in Cambridge. I. 279.

Eyre, or *Eyres*, William. Meditates a kind of Polyglot Bible in the reign of James the First. I. 125. His letter upon the subject. I. 125, 126. Refers to some similar design which had been entertained by Mr. Lively. I. 125.

F.

Fern, or *Fearne*, Henry. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 301. In what way. ibid. His education and preferments. I. 301, 302. First who wrote in defence of King Charles I. ibid. Driven from his benefice. ibid. Defends the Church of England. I. 303, 304. Bishop of Chester. I. 303. His publications. ibid. His character. I. 304.

Ferrar, Nicholas. His plans of a Polyglot. I. 72.

Frommannus, E. A. His excellent cautions in respect to rabbinical learning. I. 223. In respect to the Hebrew tongue. II. 345.

Fuller, Nicholas. A great Oriental critic. I. 125.

Fuller, William. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 304. In what way. I. 305. Dean of Ely. ibid. A good linguist. ibid. Suffers for his loyalty. ibid.

G.

Gataker, Thomas. A profound Hebrew critic. I. 125.

Gauden, Bishop. Called by Baxter the most constant helper of *his* party at the Savoy Conference. I. 136. His acute pen, called by Baxter his *bitter* pen, in remarks upon the English Liturgy. I. 136, 137. Certainly the

author of the Εικων Βασιλικη, or the Meditations frequently ascribed to King Charles the first. I. 138, 139. His own letters on the subject, preserved in the Library at Lambeth Palace. I. 139, et seq.

Gell, Dr. His idle attack, in 1650, upon the authorized Translators of the English Bible. I. 93. His other objections in 1659. I. 94. Lewis's character of him. ibid.

Greaves, John. An accomplished Persic and Arabic scholar. I. 128. His Persian Lexicon, and Letter to Archbishop Usher. I. 196, 197.

Greaves, Thomas. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 225, et seq. His particular aid. I. 226, 227. His preferments. I. 229. Dispossessed of his fellowship in the Great Rebellion. ibid. His high character. ibid. His Oration upon the Arabic Language. ibid. His Oriental MSS. I. 230.

Gregorie, or *Gregory*, John. A profound Oriental scholar. I. 98, 127. His Notes on Scripture. I. 98.

Grotius, Hugo. Dr. Hammond's opinion of him. I. 260. Concerning notes from his works. II. 118, 119. His character by Dr. Walton. II. 120, 121.

Gunning, Peter. His testimony as to the declarations of Archbishop Usher upon certain Calvinistical points of doctrine. I. 206, 207.

H.

Hales, John. His Oration upon the death of Sir Thomas Bodley. I. 123.

Hales, William. Clerk of Henry the 8th's hanaper, well skilled in Hebrew. I. 109.

Hammond, Henry. A master of Oriental languages. I. 124. Letters respecting Archbishop Usher. I. 199, et seq.

An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 282. In what way. ibid. His account of the Magdalene College MS. of the New Testament. ibid. His notice of Dr. Walton in the Preface to his Paraphrase on the Psalms. I. 283. His education and preferments. I. 283, 284. Deprived of his preferments, and imprisoned. I. 284. Bishopric of Worcester designed for him at the Restoration. ibid. His death. ibid. His character and works. I. 285. Vindication of his Paraphrase on the New Testament from the reflections made by Le Clerc in his Supplement to the Paraphrase. I. 285, 286.

Hardie, Claude. Dr. Walton records literary obligation to him, and in a curious manner. I. 316, 317.

Harding, Dr. Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. I. 118. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Harlow, Sir Robert. His illiberal behaviour. I. 22.

Harrison, Thomas. Eminently skilled in Hebrew. I. 116. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Heath, Richard. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 268. In what way. ibid. Accomplished in the Eastern tongues. ibid. Presented by Dr. Walton with a copy of the Polyglot. I. 269.

Hebrew alphabet and character. The question concerning them discussed. II. 286, 287, 341, et seq.

Hebrew Language. Formerly part of the education of ladies. I. 100, 101. Useful observations respecting it. II. 344, 345, 346.

Hebrew Professorships. Founded at both our Universities by Henry VIII. I. 97.

Hebrew Punctuation. Maintainers of the novelty of it. II. 322. Of the antiquity of it. II. 323. See also *Punctuation*.

Hebrew Text. Authority of it. II. 286, et seq.

Hebrew Types. Observations on the use of them in this country. I. 113, et seq.

Heidegger, J. H. Republished Dr. Walton's Prolegomena to the Polyglot with a Preface. I. 75.

Henry, King, VIII. Hebrew learning in England during his reign. I. 95. Hebrew Professorships founded by him. I. 97.

Hobbes, John. His Leviathan exposed. II. 319, 320.

Holland, Dr. T. Skilled in Hebrew. I. 117. His Sermon ibid. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. I. 116.

Hooker, Richard. Deputy Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. I. 123.

Hooper, Bishop, the Martyr. Skilled in Hebrew. I. 99.

Horsley, Bishop. His Translation of Hosea. I. 131.

Hudson, Dr, Keeper of the Bodleian Library. I. 265.

Huish, Alexander. An assistant in the Polyglot, of the highest class. I. 269. His valuable services. ibid. His Hymn from the Alexandrian MS. I. 271. His education and preferments, I. 274, 275. A great sufferer in the civil war. I. 275. Driven from place to place. I. 276. Deprived of his preferments and imprisoned. ibid. Liberated and restored to what he had lost, with addition. ibid. His Lectures on the Lord's Prayer. ibid.

Hyde, Thomas. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 261, et seq. His important aid. I. 261, 262. Reliques of the ancient Persian tongue addressed to him, I. 262. His observations on the ancient Persian language. I. 262. The pupil of Wheelock. I. 263. His preferments. I. 263, 264. Of his writings. I. 264. His letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. I. 265, 266. Skilled in the Chinese tongue. I. 266, 267. Eminently learned in other Oriental languages. I. 267. His valuable publications. ibid. Other works designed by him for the press. I. 268

I.

Jacob, Henry. A prodigy of Oriental as well as philological learning. I. 128.
James, King, I. Hebrew learning in England during his reign. I. 124, et seq.
1 *John* v. 8. The genuineness of this verse considered. II. 327, 328.
Johnson, John. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 311. Recommended as chaplain to the English merchants at Aleppo. I. 312.
Judgments. Accidents so called, and by whom. I. 154, 155.

K.

Keri and Ketib. What they are. II. 112, 113, 139, 140, et seq.
Kilby, Dr. R. A profound Hebrician. I. 117. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.
King, Geoffry. Regius Professor of Hebrew bridge. I. 117. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.
Knatchbull, Sir Norton. His excellent Annotations upon difficult texts in the New Testament. I. 286.

L.

Ladies. Formerly instructed in Hebrew. I. 100.
Lambeth Library. The books therein sent to Cambridge. I. 239. Restored to their old abode. ibid.

Langbaine, Gerard. An excellent linguist. I. 127.
Laud, Archbishop. His remarks on church-ceremonies. I. 14. His account of Lecturers. I. 17.
Layfield, Dr. A great Hebrew critic. I. 106. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Referred to by the learned Gataker with confidence. ibid.
Lecturers. Description of them in the time of King Charles the First. I. 16, 17.
Levelling System. In the time of the Great Rebellion. I. 308.
Lightfoot, John. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 220, et seq. His particular exertions in aid of it. I. 66, 221. His triumphant speech upon the progress of it. ibid. His rabbinical Miscellanies. I. 222. Commended by Otto, or Otho, in his Lexicon Rabbinico-Theolog. I. 223. His advice to that lexicographer. I. 223. His preferments. I. 224. Afterwards one of the Assembly of Divines. ibid. Once misled by them. ibid. His learned and valuable works. I. 225.
Lithuanian Version of the Bible. See *Chylinsky*.
Liturgy of the Church of England. Bishop Gauden's remarks upon it. I. 136, 137. Cheshire Petition in behalf of it. I. 151, et seq. Lord Clarendon's remarks upon it. I. 156, 157. The set form of it illustrated. II. 194. Cried down by sectaries. II. 203, 388.
Lively, Edward. Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. I. 107. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Appealed to by the greatest critics. I. 107, 108. Interesting description of his great qualifications as a Translator, and of his death, by Dr. Playfere. I. 108, et seq. Intended a complete Hebrew Grammar. I. 108. His Annotations on some of the Prophets. I. 107, 110. His Chronology. I. 110.
Loftus, Dudley. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 248, et seq. Well skilled both in the Eastern and Western

tongues. I. 248. Regarded and promoted by Archbishop Usher. I. 249. His particular aid to the Polyglot. I. 250. Assists Dr. Castell also. I. 251. Character of his immense learning by Castell. ibid. His Oriental publications. I. 251, 252. His MSS. I. 252, 253.

Lowth, Bishop. His Translation of Isaiah. I. 130, 131, 132.

M.

Malignant. Observations on the use of this word in the Great Rebellion. I. 24.

Manuscript Psalter. Hebrew and Latin, Trinity College, Cambridge. I. 192.

Mary, Queen. Hebrew learning in England during her reign. I. 98.

Masorites. Their method of pointing the text of Scripture. II. 216, et seq.

Mawer, Dr. John. His notice of the birth-place of Dr. Walton. I. 3. His proposal of additions to the London Polyglot. I. 326, et seq.

May-Games. Decried by the Puritans. I. 277. Occupy the attention of the Committee for reforming the University of Oxford. ibid. Downfall of them, a publication so called. I. 278. Description of the publication. ibid.

Mayne, Dr. Jasper. His description of the degenerate sons of the University of Oxford in 1646. I. 28. His fine address to the members of the University. I. 29.

Mede, Joseph. A profound Hebrew critic. I. 125.

Merchant-Taylors' School. Cultivation of Hebrew learning there. I. 102.

Mercurius Rusticus. A loyal publication in the time of

the Great Rebellion, conducted by Dr. Bruno Ryves. I. 308.

Michaelis, J. D. Differed from Bishop Lowth upon the subject of conjectural emendations. I. 131.

Mill, Dr. John. His collations of the New Testament noticed. I. 79. Original letter respecting the death of this valuable scholar. ibid.

Milton, John. His indignation against the Assembly of Divines. I. 181.

Minsheu, John. His Dictionary the first book printed, in this country, by subscription. I. 87.

Mulcaster, Richard. The teacher of Bishop Andrewes, and skilled in Oriental learning. I. 102.

N.

Neale, T. Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. Presented to Queen Elizabeth his Translation of the Prophets from the Hebrew. I. 101.

Newcome, Archbishop. His Translation of Hosea. I. 130.

New England Bibles. I. 172.

Norris, William. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 316. Fellow of Peter House, Cambridge. ibid.

O.

Oriental Learning. Successful cultivation of it in this country from the time of Henry VIII., to the time when Dr. Walton flourished. I. 94, et seq. Its progress in the reign of Elizabeth. I. 101. Cultivated in Public Schools, as well as in both Universities. I. 101, 102. Skill in the Oriental tongues at Cambridge, in the time

of the Great Rebellion, greatest in King's College. I. 241.

Original Text of Scripture. The purity and authority of it finely illustrated. II. 328.

Overal, Bishop. Admitted by Archbishop Usher to have been right in doctrine upon the points of Grace, Free-will, Election, and Reprobation; that he also agreed with him; and that he did not approve the doctrine of Geneva. I. 205, 207, 209.

Owen, Dr. John. Published a tract against the London Polyglot. I. 73, 74. Ventured beyond his knowledge. I. 74. Castigated and refuted by Dr. Walton. ibid. His little skill in Oriental learning. II. 30. His quarrel against the editors of the London Polyglot. II. 36. His attack upon the work exposed and overthrown. *passim.* Account of the controversy between him and Dr. Walton, by his own biographer. II. 312. Allowed to have no profound acquaintance with the learning which he dared to traduce. II. 313, 314. Schooled as a dunce. II. 314.

Oxford. The retreat of the loyal and learned Clergy in the Great Rebellion. I. 26. Description of her degenerate sons in 1646. I. 28. Fine address to the members of the University in that year also. I. 29.

P.

Pace, Dr. R. Hebrew scholar and critic. I. 95. His publication. ibid. Commended by Erasmus. I. 96.

Parliamentary Preachers. Their abuse of the regular Clergy. I. 307. Their grimaces. ibid.

Pennington, Isaac. A notorious anarchist, and factious lord-mayor of London. I. 11. Presents a petition

against church-government, which was exposed and ridiculed by Lord Digby. ibid.

Persian Language. Remarks on the ancient and modern. I. 262, 263.

Persian Versions of Scripture. II. 201, 339, 340.

Petræus, T. His Versions of Scripture. I. 171.

Philpot, the martyr. A learned Hebrician. I. 99. His publications. ibid.

Pierce, Thomas. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 276, 277. In what manner. I. 277. A chorister, demy, fellow, and president of Magdalene College, Oxford. ibid. Ejected from his fellowship in the Great Rebellion. ibid. A poet and a wit. I. 278. A smooth preacher. I. 279. Dean of Salisbury. ibid. Strong lines, written by him, descriptive of the dominant faction in his time. I. 280. A zealous son of the Church of England. I. 280. Wood's general excellent character of him. I. 281. His numerous publications. I. 282.

Playfere, Dr. Thomas. Extract from his interesting Sermon upon the death of the great Oriental scholar, Mr. Edward Lively. I. 108, et seq.

Pocock, Edward. His fine testimony to the excellence of the authorized English Version of the Bible. I. 93. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 215, et seq. His preferments. ibid. Makes an edition of the Syriac New Testament complete. ibid. A master of many Oriental tongues. I. 216. Letter from Dr. Walton to him. I. 217. Deprived of his canonry of Christ Church. I. 218. Restored to it. ibid. His works. I. 218. His share in the Polyglot. I. 58. 218, et seq. His Oriental MSS. I. 220.

Points, Hebrew. See *Punctuation.*

Polyglot Bible, the London. First description of it. I. 31. Approbation of the description by learned and eminent men. I. 44. Encouraged by the Council of State.

I. 45, 46. Propositions concerning it. I. 46. Public letter respecting both the description and the propositions. I. 51. Original specimen of the work. I. 51, 52. 61. Great subscriptions to the work. I. 60. Advertisement to subscribers delivered with the first volume of the London Polyglot. I. 68. Ineffectual opposition to the work. I. 71. When finished. I. 72. Prohibited by the papal interdict. I. 75. Languages used in it. I. 76. Title of it. ibid. Description of the volumes. I. 77, et seq. The vast utility of the treasures contained in the work. I. 78, 79. Concerning the dedication of it. I. 81. Of the cancelled parts of the Preface. I. 85. Altered parts in the Critical Apparatus. I. 85, 86. Refutation of a slander respecting the printing of this Polyglot. I. 86. Considered, not quite correctly, as the first book printed by subscription in England. I. 87. The first prompters of it by their line of study, and their remarks. I. 94, 125, 126. Additions to it proposed. I. 320, Dedication of it to King Charles the Second. I. 340, et seq. Generally approved. II. 37. More performed in it than in any former edition. II. 6, 7. Usefulness of it. II. 7, 8.

Pope, the. His infallibility opposed at Cambridge by Dr. Walton. I. 8.

Popish Innovations. Unjustly charged upon the Church of England. I. 15.

Prideaux, Bishop. Often appealed to by Dr. Walton upon points of Hebrew criticism. I. 127. II. 12, et seq.

Prolegomena to the London Polyglot. No private or new opinions in them. II. 26, 27, 91, 92. Defended. II. 77, et seq. Contents of them described. II. 348. Finely eulogized by Dathe. II. 351. Twice republished. I. 75.

Protestants. Unjustly charged with a plot against the original Texts of Scripture. II. 9, et seq.

Punctuation, Hebrew. The controversy upon this subject. II. 206, et seq. 242, et seq. 273, et seq.

Puritans. Eagerly pronounced every accident an especial judgment. I. 154, 155. Their hatred of May-games and customs. I. 278.

R

Rabbinical learning. Observations upon it. I. 223. Strongly commended by Dr. Lightfoot. ibid. Excellent cautions respecting it by E. H. Frommannus. I. 223, 224.

Rainolds, or *Reinolds,* Dr. An excellent linguist. I. 116. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Reformation of the Universities by the Puritans. In putting down May-games at Oxford. I. 277, 278. In advising at Cambridge the buying in impropriations, and sending abroad those whom they called evangelical preachers. I. 279.

Richardson, Dr. John, Bishop of Ardagh. Apparently considered as one of the original assistants in the London Polyglot. I. 62. Archbishop Usher's letter to him, ibid. His notes on the Old Testament. I. 63.

Ross, Hugh. His disingenuous conduct in regard to his publication, pretending a necessity for a new Translation of the Bible. I. 134.

Ryves, Bruno. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 4, 306. And in the business of the London Tithes, ibid. A noted preacher. ibid. Curious representation of his parishioners as to his doctrine. I. 307. Deprived of his benefices. ibid. Cruelly used in the Great Rebellion. I. 308. At length, Dean of Windsor. I. 309.

S.

Samaritan letters. Antiquity of them. II. 291, et seq. Ancient coins stamped with them. II. 293. Pretences urged against them exploded and confuted. II. 296, et seq.

Samaritan Pentateuch. I. 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 194. II. 189, et seq. 336, 337.

Sanderson, Robert. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 296. In what way. ibid. Character of him and his sermons. ibid. His fondness of antiquities. I. 298, 299. Shewn particularly when he was a bishop. I. 299. His preferments. I. 300. His losses. ibid. Preferred to the see of Lincoln. ibid. His regard for the Church of England expressed in his will. ibid.

Saravia, Adrian. Skilled in several languages. I. 103. The teacher of the great Oriental scholar, Nicholas Fuller. ibid. Answered objections of the Puritans against an English Version of the Psalms. I. 103, 104. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Sclater, Dr. W. His fine character of Professor Wheelock in a Sermon at his funeral. I. 234, et seq.

Scudamore, Lord. The great friend of the loyal Clergy, during their sufferings in the Great Rebellion. I. 210, 297.

Seaman, Mr. His Turkish New Testament. I. 171. An assistant to Dr. Castell. ibid.

Sectaries. Their abuse of the Liturgy of the Church of England. II. 203, et seq. and 340.

Sedgwick, Obadiah. His efforts to excite rebellion. I. 23. And to eject the regular Clergy. I. 25.

Selden, John. His curious Letter to Francis Tayler. I. 40, 41. A great friend to the design and progress of

the London Polyglot. I. 45, 50, 316. His kindness to Meric Casaubon. I. 316. His correspondence with Archbishop Usher. I. 184, 196.

Septuagint Version of Scripture. II. 198, et seq. 325, 328.

Sheldon, Gilbert. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 290. In what way. ibid. Denied the Pope to be Antichrist. I. 291. His preferments. I. 291, 292. His liberality and charity. ibid.

Shepreve, John. A great linguist. I. 97.

Sherlock, Bishop. The method of arguing, which he has adopted in his Trial of the Witnesses, found in an old forgotten tract. I. 278.

Sherman, Dr. John. A zealous promoter of the Polyglot. I. 316.

Shiloh. The prophecy respecting Shiloh illustrated. II. 326.

Shirwode, Robert. Hebrew scholar and critic. I. 95. His publication. ibid.

Simon, Father. His proposed Polyglot. I. 322.

Smith, Miles. A most profound Oriental scholar. I. 117. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Smith, Thomas. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 255, et seq. In what way. ibid. A great Oriental scholar. I. 256. Curious letter to him from Dr. Hammond. I. 257, 258. His death. I. 261.

Smith, Dr. Thomas. Chaplain to the English Ambassador at Constantinople. I. 256. His intention to collate and publish the Alexandrian MS. ibid. Author of many valuable works. ibid.

Spalding, Robert. Accomplished in Hebrew learning. I. 116. Tutor of the celebrated Gataker. ibid. One of our translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Spelman, Sir Henry. Just encomium upon him. I. 238.

Sterne, Richard. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 293. In what way. ibid. His preferments. I. 294. His loyalty. ibid. His great sufferings for it. I. 294—296. Attended

Archbishop Laud on the scaffold. I. 297. Relieved by Lord Scudamore. ibid. Taught a school. ibid. Bishop of Carlisle, and Archbishop of York. ibid. His promising countenance noticed by Baxter, with the lamentation that he was not a correct physiognomist. I. 297, 298.

Stokes, David. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 255. In what way. Ibid. His Exposition of the twelve Minor Prophets. ibid.

Syriac Commentary upon the greater part of the Old and New Testament. I. 195, 196.

Syriac Versions of Scripture. II. 185, et seq. 324, 325, 336. Of the Pentateuch. I. 194, 195. Old Testament from the Greek, distinguished with marks and stars. I. 187. Parcels of the New Testament. I. 187, 194.

T.

Talmud, Difference of its readings. II. 65.

Targum upon the Chronicles. I. 321, 324, 325, 326.

Tayler, Francis. His version of the Jerusalem Targum. I. 39. Letter to him from Selden. I. 40.

Teigh, or *Tighe*, Robert. A profound linguist. I. 106. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid.

Θεὸς, 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. This reading illustrated and defended. I. 272—275.

Thorne, William, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. I. 124.

Thorndike, Herbert. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 209, et seq. His preferments. I. 209, 210. Deprived of them in the Great Rebellion. I. 210. Relieved by Lord Scudamore. ibid. Restored to his fellowship. ibid. Slanderously said to be popishly affected. I. 210, 211. His excellent character. I. 211. His opinion of the Church of Rome. I. 212, 213. His works. I. 213. His

letter to Archbishop Usher on the subject of the Polyglot. I. 214. His testimony as to the declarations of Archbishop Usher upon certain Calvinistical points of doctrine. I. 205, 206.

1 Timothy iii. 16. A reading in this verse considered. I. 272, 273.

Tithes, London. Unjustly withheld from the Clergy. I. 4. Exceptions of Parishioners to the demands of the Clergy. I. 10.

Tonstall, Cuthbert. Pronounced a good Hebrician. I. 98.

Translation of the Bible. A new one in English projected in 1652. I. 89. Revived in 1656-7. I. 90. Consultations upon the subject. I. 90, 91. The present authorized Translation then allowed to be the best extant. I. 91. Singly, as well as jointly, so allowed to be by Dr. Walton. ibid. Fine remark upon the general correctness of it by Dr. Walton. I. 92. Some objections against it by the Puritans and others. I. 93. New illustrations of the authorized English Translation. I. 94, et seq.

Translations of the Scriptures. Uses of them. II. 92, 99. Not equalled to the Original, but subservient to it. II. 96. Wonderful consent of all of them. II. 325, 326, 330.

Translators of the authorized English Bible. Calumniated II. 5.

Turner, Dr. P. A physician, and distinguished Hebrew and Arabic scholar. I. 127.

Tyndal, William. His skill in Hebrew, and justness of translation, commended by distinguished Oriental scholars. I. 98.

U.

Various Readings of the Bible. Calumniated. II. 14. Illustrated and defended. II. 59, et seq. Distinguished.

II. 80, 61. In what case they may be gathered out of Translations. II. 100, et seq, False consequences inferred from them. II. 158, et seq. The great utility of them. II. 316, et seq.

Udall, John. Published a translation of Martinius's Hebrew Grammar, with Additions. I. 123.

Vicars, or *Viccars*, John. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 254, et seq. In what way. I. 254. A different person from him of the same name, presently mentioned, of canting memory. ibid. An Oriental scholar, cited by critics of our own and other countries. ibid. His Decapla in Psalmos. ibid.

Vicars, John. Of Hudibrastic fame. I. 16. Launches out into much praise of Lecturers at the opening of the Great Rebellion. ibid.

Usher, Archbishop. His approbation of the projected London Polyglot. I. 45. Transmits to Cappellus, at Saumur, the first sheet of the London Polyglot. I. 67. His Collations of MSS. of the New Testament. I. 79, 182. II. 148, 330. An assistant in the Polyglot. I. 179, et seq. Perhaps formed his intimacy with Dr. Walton at Oxford. I. 180. Placed by Dr. Walton at the head of his literary benefactors. I. 182. His curious letters upon Oriental and biblical criticism. I. 183, et seq. Disdained to join the Assembly of Divines. I. 181. Affecting letter to him from Meric Casaubon. I. 316 Letters to him from Sir Thomas Davis at Aleppo. I. 184, et seq. to and from Dr. Samuel Ward. I. 192, et seq. from Mr. J. Greaves. I. 197. from Dr. Arnold Boate. I. 196, et seq. to and from Dr. Hammond. I. 199, et seq. His Various Readings of the New Testament. I. 199. Lent by him to Dr. Hammond. ibid. Offers to send Bootius a book of Mr. Eyres, which would ease him of much trouble in his projected contest with Cappellus. I. 201, 202. Receives from Bootius a refusal of this favour. I. 202. Disclaimed

notions which defended or propagated Calvinism. I. 203. Extract from his Sermon, when bishop of Meath. I. 203, 204. His declarations on Calvinistical points, attested by Dr. Walton, Mr. Thorndike, and Mr. Gunning. I. 205, et seq.

Vulgar Latin Version of Scripture. II. 197, et seq. and 338.

W.

Wakfield, or *Wakefield*, Robert. Oriental scholar and critic. I. 96, 97. Pronounced one of the first masters in England of Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic. I. 97. His publications. I. 97, 98.

Wakfield, or *Wakefield*, Thomas. Hebrew Professor at Cambridge. I. 97.

Walton, Brian. Born at Seymour, or Seamer, in Cleveland. I. 3. First of Magdalen College, Cambridge. ibid. Next, of Peter House, ibid. Master of a school in Suffolk, ibid. Rector of St. Martin's Orgar, London. ibid. Conducts the business of the London tithes. I. 4. His collections and treatise on the subject. I. 6, 7. Instituted to the rectories of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, London, and of Sandon, county of Essex. I. 7. Chaplain to the king. I. 8. Prebendary of St. Paul's. ibid. Opposes at Cambridge the infallibility of the Pope. ibid. Loses his first wife. I. 9. Account of her. ibid. Some of his London Parishioners unjustly represent him. I. 10. Exhibit articles against him. I. 11. What those articles were. I. 14. Dr. Walton defends the Church of England against the charge of Popish innovations. I. 15. Refuses a lecturer at the charge and election of his parishioners. I. 16, 17. Taken into custody as a delinquent. I. 20. Insulted in giving his testimony before a committee, by Isaac Pennington. I. 22. Supplanted at Sandon by an

"able preaching minister," the term for a parliamentary priest. I. 24. Dispossessed of both his rectories. I. 25. Supposed, with little reason, to have written a pamphlet at Oxford. I. 27. Formed at Oxford the design of his Polyglot. ibid. Incorporated D. D. there. I. 28. Returns from Oxford, to the house of Dr. Fuller in London, with collections for his Polyglot. I. 29. Submitted his plan to many bishops. I. 30. Circulation of his proposals. I. 31. His letter to Archbishop Usher. I. 62. Description of his Introduction to the reading of the Oriental Tongues. I. 69, 70. Editions of it. 70, 71. Vindicates his Polyglot against the attack of Dr. J. Owen. I. 74, 75. II. *passim*. Dedicated his Polyglot to King Charles II. not to Cromwell. I. 82. Thanks the king for the noble answer he returned on the application made for that purpose. ibid. Informs his Majesty of his original determination. I. 83. Refers to witnesses of it. ibid. Exposes the subtilty of Cromwell. ibid. Threatened with a suppression of his work. I. 84. Delivered both from the extortion of a dedication to Cromwell, and from any fury of the Usurper. ibid. Statement of his alteration of the passage as to Cromwell's grant in regard to the paper. I. 84, 85. Appointed to consider of a new English Version of the Bible. I. 90. Agrees that the authorized Version is the best of any of the Translations. I. 91, 92. He and his assistants acquired their Oriental learning in the age of James the first. I. 126. Consecrated bishop of Chester. I. 135. One of the Commissioners at the Savoy Conference. ibid. Speaks in favour of Baxter. I. 136. His reception at Chester. I. 148, et seq. Accidents stated to have occurred on his coming to Chester. I. 155, 156. His concurrence with other bishops upon the settlement of the Liturgy. I. 156. His death. I. 157. His funeral. I. 158. His monument. I. 158, et seq. His library. I. 160, 161. His testimony as to the decla-

rations of Archbishop Usher upon certain Calvinistical points of doctrine. I. 205, 207. His additions to P. Young's notes. I. 288, 289. Acknowledges the intended service of Dr. Meric Casaubon. I. 318. Records literary obligation to Claude Hardie in a curious manner. I. 316, 317. And to many other scholars. ibid. His Vindication of the Polyglot, now republished. I. 75. II. 1, et seq. His Prolegomena to the Polyglot republished. I. 75. His Reasons for writing the Vindication of his Polyglot. II. 17, 18. Severely, but not justly, censured by a recent biographer of Dr. John Owen. II. 314, 316.

Warburton, Dr. G. Curious extract from his sermon preached before King James the first. II. 311.

Ward, Samuel. A biblical and Oriental critic. I. 120. One of our Translators of the authorized Bible. ibid. Specimen of the manner in which he proceeded with his share of the Translation. ibid. The friend of Archbishop Usher. ibid. His Adversaria in Sidney College, Cambridge. I. 120. His collation of ancient versions of part of Genesis. I. 121. His Letters to Archbishop Usher. I. 192, et seq.

Wheelock, Abraham. His letter upon the design of the London Polyglot. I. 55. An assistant in it. I. 230, et seq. His particular services. I. 231. Account of his Persian Gospels. I. 231, 232. His preferments. ibid. His circumstances not easy. I. 232. His letter to the Vice-chancellor of Cambridge. I. 232, 233. Fine character of him by Dr. Sclater. I. 234, et seq. His Persian Gospels completed for the press by Mr. Pierson, and published at the charge of Sir T. Adams. I. 241. His edition of Bede. I. 242. His Anglo Saxon Lexicon MS. British Museum. I. 243.

White, Dr. Joseph. His disapprobation of Mr. Pratt's Prospectus of a New Polyglot. I. 333.

Whole Duty of Man. Inquiries as to the author of that work. I. 293.

Worthington, Dr. His interesting account of Dr. Castell and his labours. I. 164, et seq. and 171.

Wilkins, Dr. David. His publication of the Targum upon the Chronicles. I. 246, 324, 325, 326.

Willet, Andrew. An eminent biblical critic. I. 104.

Y.

Young, Patrick. The use of his notes for the Polyglot. I. 64, 286. Account of him. I. 286, 287. Intended to collate and publish the Alexandrian MS. I. 287. Published the Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians. ibid. His death in 1652. I. 288. Dr. Walton's description of his notes, obtained after his decease. I. 288. Dr. Walton's additions to them. I. 288, 289.

Printed by R. Gilbert, St. John's Square, London.

651

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—BERKELEY
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

7Jan55DW
JUN 7 - 1955 LU
AUG 17 REC'D
8Sep'61EC
REC'D LD
SEP 8 1961
9 Nov'61 [illegible]
REC'D LD
OCT 26 1961
JUL 02 1992
10-9-92

LD 21-100m-1,'54(1887s16)476

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C039578864